

(S)

STUDY PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

JUNE 1982

THE DECISION TO ACCEPT OR DECLINE COMMAND: AN
ANALYSIS OF CONSIDERATIONS BY FY 82 05/06
SELECTEES AND A CGSC SAMPLE

by

COLONEL CHARLES T. MYERS, CE
COLONEL THOMAS R. CUTHBERT, JA
LIEUTENANT COLONEL THEODORE C. FICHTL, MI

NOV 22 1982

A

US ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013



Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

82 11 22 02 5

DISC FILE COPY

AD A121648

Item 20. (Continued)

and provide narrative comments on individually derived considerations. Survey Data was analyzed using automated correlation techniques. Narrative comments were catalogued, characterized and subjectively analyzed using a conceptual framework developed by the study group. Variations in trends were discernable among the three groups surveyed. Factors cited as extremely sensitive by the 06 respondent group tended to have a differing impact when considered by 05s and junior field grade students attending CGSC. Insensitive management procedures, turbulence, impacts on high school age children appear to be universally key aspects in all three groups.

The influence of OPMS on career expectations is clear as trends are traced back into the responses of more junior officers. Recommendations based on the study incorporate reassessment of the impact of shifting demographic data, and modification of certain critical functions related to command program management.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE		READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM
1. REPORT NUMBER	2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. A121 648	3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER
4. TITLE (and Subtitle) The Decision to Accept or Decline Command: An Analysis of Considerations by FY 82 05/06 Selectees and a CGSC Sample		5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED Student Paper
		6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER
7. AUTHOR(s) Charles T. Myers, Col. CE, Thomas R. Cuthbert, Col. JA, Theodore C. Fichtl, LTC, MI		8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)
9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS US Army War College Carlisle, Barracks, PA 17013		10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS
11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS Same		12. REPORT DATE 4 June 1982
		13. NUMBER OF PAGES 125
14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)		15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report) Unclassified
		15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE
16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report) Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.		
17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)		
18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES		
19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)		
20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number) The study is an extension and expansion of a 1979 study which focused on highlighting critical factors contributing to acceptance or declination of command. Using an approved survey instrument, FY 82 officers were polled and requested to quantitatively indicate reactions to a wide range of factors which reflect characteristics of the current centralized command selection process. Additionally respondents were requested to provide family data and career pattern information. Finally, respondents were requested to quantitatively evaluate their perceptions of key management aspects of the command selection process		

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any other agencies. This document may be open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

US ARMY WAR COLLEGE
MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

THE DECISION TO ACCEPT OR DECLINE COMMAND: AN
ANALYSIS OF CONSIDERATIONS BY FY 82 05/06
SELECTEES AND A CGSC SAMPLE

A GROUP STUDY PROJECT

BY

COLONEL CHARLES T. MYERS, CE
COLONEL THOMAS R. CUTHBERT, JA
LIEUTENANT COLONEL THEODORE C. FICHTL MI



2 JUNE 1982

Approved for public release;
distribution unlimited.

Accession	
NTIS	✓
DTIC TAB	
Unannounced	
Justification	
Distribution Codes	
Dist	
A	

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT	iv
PREFACE	v
CHAPTER I INTRODUCTION	1
Background	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Investigative Procedures	2
CHAPTER II 0-6 RESPONDENT DATA	4
General	4
Specific Statistics	4
Discussion	15
CHAPTER III 0-5 RESPONDENT DATA	20
General	20
Specific Statistics	21
Discussion	32
CHAPTER IV C&GSC RESPONDENT DATA	37
General	37
Specific Statistics	37
Discussion	47
CHAPTER V 0-6 WRITTEN COMMENTS	50
CHAPTER VI 0-5 WRITTEN COMMENTS	68
CHAPTER VII C&GSC WRITTEN COMMENTS	102
CHAPTER VIII DISCUSSION	113
CHAPTER IX CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	121
Conclusions	121
Recommendations	123
APPENDIX 1. 0-5/0-6 SURVEY INSTRUMENT	TAB A
APPENDIX 2. C&GSC SURVEY INSTRUMENT	TAB B
APPENDIX 3. SURVEY RESPONSE-0-6 COMBINED	TAB C
APPENDIX 4. SURVEY RESPONSE-0-6 ACCEPTEES	TAB D

APPENDIX 5.	SURVEY RESPONSE 0-6 DECLINEES	TAB E
APPENDIX 6.	SURVEY RESPONSE 0-5 COMBINED	TAB F
APPENDIX 7.	SURVEY RESPONSE 0-5 ACCEPTEES	TAB G
APPENDIX 8.	SURVEY RESPONSE 0-5 DECLINEES	TAB H
APPENDIX 9.	SURVEY RESPONSE C&GSC	TAB I

AUTHORS: Charles T. Myers, Col. CE, Thomas R. Cuthbert, Col, JA,
Theodore C. Fichtl, LTC, MI

TITLE: The Decision to Accept or Decline Command: An Analysis of
Considerations by FY 82 05/06 Selectees and a CGSC Sample

FORMAT: Group Study Project

DATE: 4 June 1982 **Pages:** 125 **Classification:** Unclassified

The study is an extension and expansion of a 1979 study which focused on highlighting critical factors contributing to acceptance or declination of command. Using an approved survey instrument, FY 82 officers were polled and requested to quantitatively indicate reactions to a wide range of factors which reflect characteristics of the current centralized command selection process. Additionally respondents were requested to provide family data and career pattern information. Finally, respondents were requested to quantitatively evaluate their perceptions of key management aspects of the command selection process and provide narrative comments on individually derived considerations. Survey Data was analyzed using automated correlation techniques. Narrative comments were catalogued, characterized and subjectively analyzed using a conceptual framework developed by the study group. Variations in trends were discernable among the three groups surveyed. Factors cited as extremely sensitive by the 06 respondent group tended to have a differing impact when considered by 05s and junior field grade students attending CGSC. Insensitive management procedures, turbulence, impacts on high school age children appear to be universally key aspects in all three groups.

The influence of OPMS on career expectations is clear as trends are traced back into the responses of more junior officers. Recommendations based on the study incorporate reassessment of the impact of shifting demographic data, and modification of certain critical functions related to command program management.

PREFACE

This group study was produced under the aegis of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Department of the Army and the US Army War College Department of Command and Management. The scope and general methodology were derived from a 1979 study which was modified and expanded to account for changes in the Centralized Command Selection process, Army Policy and to compare data derived from FY 82 selectee responses with those of a more junior cohort. The research paper is designed to update and refine an ongoing evaluation process.

The three authors of the study elected to participate based on personal concerns and interests which were stimulated by perceived changes in attitude toward command as an essential role for the professional military officer. An attempt was made to conduct analysis in a manner aimed at producing insights which will assist the Department of the Army in developing policies and implementing techniques which support the needs of the service and are compatible with the expectations of the majority of career officers. The outstanding assistance of the personnel in the office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, the Military Personnel Center, and the Carlisle Barracks Computer center was a major factor in the successful completion of this project.

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Background

Command is and should be one of the most important duties a career officer can aspire to. Traditional career patterns have placed a premium on attaining command and successfully commanding, particularly at the O5/O6 level. Perceptions about the responsibility to command, the desirability of command and the impact of accepting or declining the opportunity are in a state of flux. The full impact of OPMS, the current command slating process, extended command tour lengths and changes in the conditions of military family life appear to be key variables in the alteration of traditional perceptions. The result is not only a percentage of annual command declinations, but more importantly the establishment of new attitudes with respect to the command opportunity. While these attitudes may be fairly consistent among recent year selectees, they may not be correlatable to widely held perceptions found among potential out year command candidates.

Statement of the Problem

According to an Army War College Study completed in 1979, there was an increasing trend in the number of lieutenant colonels and colonels who declined the opportunity to accept battalion and brigade level commands. Prior to the 1979 study, apparently no efforts had been

undertaken to ascertain what combination of factors contributed to this trend. The 1979 study, using analytical techniques built around a questionnaire survey using the 1979 05/06 selectees, produced broad general conclusions, and recommended a follow-up effort. Because the 1979 effort was the first directed at this problem, there were several salient points derived from the original data which had to be reevaluated to determine if in the ensuing two years the key variables originally identified remain operational. Further, a hasty analysis of the 1979 effort suggested that those factors which drove 05s or 06s in one direction or the other may have deviated from the factors which may motivate younger officers as they approach the command opportunity. Command tour length, selection timing, slating procedures, TOE versus TDA command selection and planned career duration are factors which in all probability will be weighed in a somewhat different manner by mid to long term eligibles versus near term candidates. The purpose of the 1982 study was to reexamine and revalidate the trends illuminated in the 1979 study by surveying the FY 82 selectee group and to determine if those factors revealed in the previous effort parallel or deviate from the factors considered important by a junior officer sample taken from C and GSC level field grade officers.

Investigative Procedures

Data was gathered in three ways. First the data base from the 1979 study was reconstituted from the original published version. Secondly, the questionnaire used in the 1979 effort was updated to account for recent policy changes which might produce inconsistency. It was supplemented with selected new questions derived from the narrative comments found in the original work. This updated questionnaire was mailed to

the FY 82 05/06 selectee group. Finally, a second parallel questionnaire was developed to be administered to a statistically significant sample set from the current resident C and GSC class. Three separate data files were maintained. Correlation analysis was accomplished using AWC ADP support. The selectee questionnaire was approved by the Soldier Support Center, National Capitol Region and assigned SCN AT2J-NCR-MA-82-14. The C&GSC questionnaire was administered based upon agreement between the Commandant USAWC and the Commandant C&GSC.

388 O-5 questionnaires were mailed. 27 were returned by postal services. 270 responses were received, of which, 264 were processed. The return rate on Ltc command selectees was 73%.

133 O-6 questionnaires were mailed. 3 were returned by postal services. 102 responses were received, of which 100 were processed. The return rate on Col command selectees was 75%.

400 CGSC questionnaires were mailed. 297 were returned and processed for a 74% return rate.

35 Ltc declinees responded to the questionnaire. 9 Colonel declinees responded, but only 8 of these questionnaires were processed because of late receipt of the ninth response. The written comments included with that response were included into the study.

CHAPTER II

0-6 RESPONDENT DATA

General

At the time at which the list of FY 82 0-6 command selectees was provided by MILPERCEN for this study, the following data applied. The initial FY 82 slate consisted of 100 commands. 9 of the 100 principal selectees declined command, 6 were deferred and 1 was promoted. 8 of 9 declines responded in time to be included in the computer run statistical data. The ninth responded later and his written comments were included.

The data is arrayed by question as expressed in the questionnaire utilized. Since 100 responses were considered actual frequency and percentages were the same. Therefore those figures were displayed for each question by categories of all responding, acceptees and declines.

SPECIFIC STATISTICS (ABSOLUTE FREQUENCY/PERCENTAGE)

What is the source of your commission?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Service Academy	24	21	3
ROTC	68	64	4
OCS	8	7	1
Other/Direct	0	0	0

How many years commissioned service do you have (as of Dec 81)?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
25 or 26	1	1	0
23 or 24	23	21	2
21 or 22	40	38	2
19 or 20	27	23	4
17 or 18	9	9	0

How many family members are currently living with you?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
8 or more	1	1	0
6 or 7	2	2	0
4 or 5	36	32	4
2 or 3	47	45	2
1	7	6	1
Nor applicable	7	6	1

How many family relocations have you made in the last 10 years?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
More than 10	1	1	0
9 or 10	2	2	0
7 or 8	26	24	2
5 or 6	50	46	4
3 or 4	18	16	2
2 or fewer	3	3	0

How old were you at your last birthday?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
50 to 55	1	1	0
45 to 49	40	37	3
40 to 44	57	52	5
35 to 39	2	2	0

Are you responding as an 0-5 or 0-6 Command Selectee?

	<u>All Responses%</u>
0-6	100
0-5	0

Indicate your sex.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Male	99	91	8
Female	1	1	0

How many below the zone promotions have you received?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
0	27	26	1
1	24	23	1
2	31	28	3
3	11	8	3

COMMENT: 7 responses out of range and dropped

How many years have passed since your last duty at battalion level or below?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
10 or more	4	2	2
7 to 9	6	5	1
4 to 6	49	47	2
2 to 3	40	37	3
1 or less	1	1	0

Are you a:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Primary command selectee	77	73	4
Alternate command selectee	23	19	4

What type unit were you selected to command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
TOE	58	54	4
TDA	27	24	3
Other	15	14	1

Which of the following categories best specifies the unit you were elected to command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Combat Arms	29	27	2
Combat Support Arms	19	18	1
Combat Service Support Arms	25	22	3
Training	4	4	0
Other	23	21	2

If you declined command, did you decline:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Prior to being selected	0	0	0
After selection, but before slating	0	0	0
After slating	8	0	8
NA, did not decline command	92	92	0

Would you characterize your primary reason for declining command as:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Personal	0	0	0
Professional	2	0	2
Family	1	0	1
Combination	4	0	4
Retirement	1	0	1
Other	0	0	0
N/A; I did not decline command	92	92	0

Do you plan to retire within the next year?

	<u>All Responses</u>	<u>Acceptees</u>	<u>Declinees</u>
Yes	7	4	3
No	84	82	2
Undecided	8	5	3

COMMENT: 1 response out of range dropped

Did you decide to retire (within the next year) before or after you were selected for command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Before	1	0	1
After	2	0	2
N/A; do not plan to retire within the next year	96	92	4

COMMENT: 1 response out of range and dropped

Did the command for which you were selected require a PCS?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Yes	93	87	6
No	7	5	2

How much time were you or would you have been allowed to accomplish the PCS?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
two weeks or less	10	9	1
15 days to a month	17	15	2
31 days to 90 days	23	23	0
more than 90 days	44	41	3
Selection for command did not require a PCS	6	4	2

How long did you remain at the location to which you were assigned prior to your command assignment, after the selection list was published?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
less than 1 year	42	40	2
1 to 2 years	49	45	4
more than 2 years	4	2	2
Did not PCS prior to command assignment	5	5	0

Please indicate when you were selected for command by a command selection board:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
1st consideration	59	54	5
2nd consideration	30	27	3
3rd consideration	4	4	0
4th consideration	1	1	0
Don't know	6	6	0

How did command fit in with your personal goals at the time of selection?

	<u>All Responses</u>	<u>Acceptees</u>	<u>Declinees</u>
Very negative	2	1	1
Negative	5	5	0
Neutral	4	4	0
Positive	24	22	2
Very positive	65	60	5

What was the influence of your previous command experience on your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	1	1	0
Moderate influence to decline command	4	4	0
Neutral influence	8	7	1
Moderate influence to accept command	13	11	2
Strong influence to accept command	74	69	5

Did your personal health influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Yes	21	20	1
No	79	72	7

How did the command tour length influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	4	3	1
Moderate influence to decline command	11	9	2
Neutral influence	60	55	5
Moderate influence to accept command	12	12	0
Strong influence to accept command	13	13	0

How did the geographical location of the command influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	4	3	1
Moderate influence to decline command	10	8	2
Neutral influence	41	9	2
Moderate influence to accept command	23	23	0
Strong influence to accept command	22	19	3

How did your notion of the 06/05 level command environment affect your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	3	3	0
Moderate influence to decline command	8	6	2
Neutral influence	48	42	6
Moderate influence to accept command	20	20	0
Strong influence to accept command	18	18	0

COMMENT: 3 responses out of range and dropped

How important was the timing of the offer of command in your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses</u>	<u>Acceptees</u>	<u>Declinees</u>
Strong influence to decline command	6	4	2
Moderate influence to decline command	10	7	3
Neutral influence	40	38	2
Moderate influence to accept command	23	23	0
Strong influence to accept command	21	20	1

How did the type of command for which you were selected (as specified earlier in questions 11 and 12) influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	3	1	2

Moderate influence to decline command	6	5	1
Neutral influence	28	26	2
Moderate influence to accept command	20	20	0
Strong influence to accept command	43	40	3

Did the type of Command for which you were slated correspond with your initial or additional specialty?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Initial Specialty	85	79	6
Additional Specialty	8	7	1
Neither Specialty	7	6	1

How did the personality of the person or persons you would be working with affect your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	3	2	1
Moderate influence to decline command	3	3	0
Neutral influence	73	67	6
Moderate influence to accept command	14	14	0
Strong influence to accept command	7	6	1

How adequate was your previous military training and experience in preparing you for the type of command for which you were selecte?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very inadequate	3	3	0
Inadequate	6	5	1
Neutral	7	6	1
Adequate	30	29	1
Very adequate	54	49	5

Did the presence of school-age family members in your household influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	9	6	3
Moderate influence to decline command	21	20	1
Neutral influence	45	42	3
Moderate influence to accept command	8	8	0
Strong influence to accept command	6	6	0
N/A; no school age family members	11	10	1

How did the health of family members influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses</u>	<u>Acceptees</u>	<u>Declinees</u>
Strong influence to decline command	3	1	2
Moderate influence to decline command	5	4	1
Neutral influence	58	57	1
Moderate influence to accept command	6	6	0
Strong influence to accept command	4	4	0
N/A	24	20	4

How did your spouse's employment influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	2	1	1
Moderate influence to decline command	9	9	0
Neutral influence	34	32	2
Moderate influence to accept command	1	1	0
Strong influence to accept command	2	2	0
My spouse is not employed	49	45	4
I am not married	3	2	1

What is your immediate family's overall attitude toward the Army?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	1	1	0
Negative	7	7	0
Neutral	7	5	2
Positive	34	34	0
Very positive	49	44	5
Not applicable	2	1	1

What was your immediate family's attitude toward your being a commander at the time of your selection?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	2	2	0
Negative	5	5	0
Neutral	8	7	1
Positive	28	27	1
Very positive	55	50	5
Not applicable	2	1	1

What was your immediate family's attitude toward the geographical location of the command for which you were slated?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	8	7	1
Negative	17	16	1
Neutral	6	6	0
Positive	33	32	1
Very positive	33	29	4
Not applicable	3	2	1

Did your family directly influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	5	2	3
Moderate influence to decline command	13	12	1
Neutral influence	33	31	2
Moderate influence to accept command	25	25	0
Strong influence to accept command	22	21	1
N/A; I do not have immediate family members	2	1	1

How did owning a home influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	6	6	0
Moderate influence to decline command	6	6	0
Neutral influence	60	55	5
Moderate influence to accept command	4	4	0
Strong influence to accept command	3	2	1
N/A; I do not own a home	21	19	2

How did the number of relocations your family has made influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	7	5	2
Moderate influence to decline command	19	18	1
Neutral influence	64	60	4
Moderate influence to accept command	4	4	0
Strong influence to accept command	3	3	0
N/A; I do not have a family to relocate	3	2	1

Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you did decline or would have declined command.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Lower than most	91	84	7
Same as peers	8	8	0
Higher than most	1	0	1

Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you did accept or would have accepted command.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Lower than most	5	5	0
Same as peers	37	34	3
Higher than most	58	53	5

Have those factors which influenced your decision to accept or decline command changed since you made your decision?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Not at all	78	72	6
Slightly	16	14	2
Moderately	5	5	0
Greatly	0	0	0
Very greatly	1	1	0

If you were permitted at this time to reconsider your decision to accept or decline command, would your decision be different or the same?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely the same	74	68	6
Probably the same	18	17	1
Not sure	3	3	0

Probably different	3	2	1
Definitely different	2	2	0

Should officers be permitted to decline consideration for command without adversely affecting subsequent personnel decisions?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely not	25	25	0
Probably not	15	15	0
Not sure	8	7	1
Probably yes	24	22	2
Definitely yes	28	23	5

Should an officer be allowed to decline command without prejudice after being slated for a particular command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely not	45	45	0
Probably not	30	27	3
Not sure	4	3	1
Probably yes	10	9	1
Definitely yes	11	8	3

How do you feel about publication of the Centralized Command Selection List?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Should be published	82	78	4
Should not be published	8	7	1
No opinion	10	7	3

What is your opinion of the selection notification procedure?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	8	7	1
Negative	22	21	1
Neutral	24	23	1
Positive	36	32	4
Very positive	10	9	1

Indicate your perception regarding the Centralized Command Selection System (CCSS) vs. the "Old Boy Net" for selecting commanders.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Old Boy Net is best	12	11	1
Both are the same	12	11	1
The CCSS is best	76	70	6

Did you decline command because you believed that you could make a greater contribution to the Army in a noncommand job?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Yes	3	0	3
No	5	0	5
N/A; I did not decline command	92	92	0

Indicate your feeling about the current command tour length.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	7	6	1
Negative	28	25	3
Neutral	15	14	1
Positive	30	29	1
Very positive	20	18	2

How would you feel about being required to complete a full command tour after receiving a promotion? (Commanding a battalion-sized unit as an 06 or a brigade as an 07?)

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	24	20	4
Negative	26	26	0
Neutral	20	10	4
Positive	19	19	0
Very positive	11	11	0

Should the Centralized Command Selection System be modified to permit MACOM Commanders to have more influence in the slating of selectees for specific command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely not	18	17	1
Probably not	26	25	1
Not sure	12	12	0
Probably yes	25	21	4
Definitely yes	19	17	2

What is your branch?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Infantry	14	12	2
Armor	11	10	1
Field Artillery	6	6	0
Air Defense Artillery	1	1	0
Engineer	20	20	0
Signal	4	4	0
Military Police	6	5	1
Military Intelligence	8	8	0
Ordnance	10	10	0
Quartermaster	8	7	1
Adjutant General	2	0	2
Medical Service	0	0	0
Aviation	1	1	0
Transportation	8	8	0
Chemical	0	0	0

COMMENT: 1 response out of range and dropped

What is your initial (primary) specialty.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
11	13	11	2
12	6	5	1
13	4	4	0
14	2	2	0
15	3	3	0
21	20	20	0
25	4	4	0
31	5	4	1
35	7	7	0
37	2	2	0
41	3	1	2
48	1	1	0
51	1	1	0
70	1	1	0
71	1	1	0
75	1	1	0
91	9	9	0
92	9	8	1
95	5	5	0

Indicate your highest level of civilian education.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Bachelor's Degree	5	4	1
Some Graduate Study	5	4	1
Master's Degree	89	83	6
Doctor's Degree	1	1	0

Indicate your highest level of military education.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
C&GSC or equivalent	1	0	1
SSC	99	92	7

In each of the next questions, indicate the position on the scale that best represents your feelings about your last command assignment.

Too Long	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Short
Good for Promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not good for promotion
High Risk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Low Risk
Dream Come True	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Nightmare
Necessary for Promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not necessary for promotion
Made a Contribution to the Army	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Did not make a Contribution to the Army
What you Entered the Army for	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not what you Entered the Army for
Was Permitted to do your own thing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Was not Permitted to do your own thing
Great for my Family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad for Family
Was a Prestigious Assignment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Was not a Prestigious Assignment

NOTE: Acceptees
 Declinees

Discussion

Demographic data for the respondents will be discussed first. Since the data includes only 8 declinees, caution must be exhibited in reading significance into contrasts between acceptees and declinees. Most respondents had between 19 and 22 years of commissioned service and was in his mid-40s. Only 1 respondent was a female and she was an acceptee. 77 of all responding were primary selectees while 23 were alternates. 4 of the declinees were primaries and 4 alternates. 39 of

the respondents had 4 or more family members in their household and 47 had 2 to 3. 59 respondents had not served at battalion level or below for 4 or more years. 66 of those responding had received one or more below the zone promotions. In the case of declinees, 6 had received 2 or more below the zone promotions. 79 respondents had experienced 5 or more family relocations in the last 10 years.

Next, the respondents' views of the various aspects of the command selection system will be examined. Over half of those responding had been selected for command at their first consideration. The timing of the offer of command appeared to have been significant in that 5 of the declinees rated it as an influence to decline and only one indicated it as a positive influence. Among the acceptees it was viewed more positively with 43 citing it as an influence to accept versus 11 as an influence to decline. Strengthening this view is the fact that only 7 respondents felt that command fit in negatively with their personal goals at the time of selection, while 89 felt that it fit in positively. 76 respondents believed that the centralized command selection system was better than the previous method for selecting commanders. 82 felt that the command selection list should be published. There was no significant difference between acceptee and declinee opinion in these two cases. A significant level of discontent with the selection notification procedure was noted with 30 viewing it negatively and only 46 positively. 44 respondents believed that the selection procedure should be modified to permit more MACOM influence in the slating process. It should be noted that 6 of these were declinees. When queried as to their willingness to remain in command to tour length completion following promotion, half of those responding answered negatively and only 30

responded positively. When asked for their feelings about the current 30 \pm 6 month command tour length, 50 responded positively versus 35 negatively.

All declinees had declined command after slating. 52 respondents felt that an officer should be permitted to decline consideration for command without adverse effect versus 40 who disagreed. 7 declinees believed that declination of consideration should be without adverse effect. Opinions shifted somewhat when the declination occurred after slating, however. 75 respondents were opposed to an officer being allowed to decline without prejudice after slating versus 21 who felt that they should. Declinee opinions were about equally divided on both sides of the issue.

Most respondents (91) felt that their chances for promotion would be lower than most if they declined command. A majority (58) felt that their chances for promotion would be higher than most if they accepted command but a substantial number (37) felt that their chances would be about the same as their peers. Acceptees and declinees appeared to feel similarly about these two questions.

Last, rationale for acceptance or declination will be considered. The declinees gave various reasons for their declination including: professional-2, family-1, retirement-1 and combination of factors-4. 3 declinees planned to retire within the next year, 2 did not and 3 were undecided. 1 of those deciding to retire did so prior to slating and 2 after slating. Most respondents were slated for a command requiring a PCS (93), with 50 of them being allowed 90 days or less to accomplish that PCS. Most respondents (including declinees) indicated that their prior command experience influenced them to accept command. 21 respondents indicated that personal health had influenced their decision but

only one of them was a declinee. A majority of respondents indicated that command tour length was a neutral influence on their decision. Only 15 indicated it to be an influence to decline command. The geographical location of the selected command did not appear to be a major factor leading toward declinations since only 14 respondents cited it as such while 45 indicated it as influencing them to accept and 41 rated it as neutral. 3 declinees cited location as a factor influencing declination. Respondents' overall notion of the command environment appeared to be good with only 11 citing it as an influence to decline command. The type of command offered also did not seem to be a major factor leading to declination. Only 9 respondents cited it as such and only 3 of these were declinees.

Because of the importance of family considerations in this area, such factors influencing acceptance or declination will be discussed together. The presence of school age children appeared to be a significant influence to decline, with 30 respondents including 4 declinees citing it as such. The majority of respondents (58) cited health of family members as a neutral influence but 3 declinees specified it as influence toward declination. Spouse's employment was viewed by most as either a neutral factor or as not applicable. The respondents' families attitudes toward both the Army and selection for command were highly positive. Family attitudes toward the geographical location of the command were mostly positive (66 responses) but a significant number (25) did respond in the negative. The majority (55) of respondents viewed homeownership as a neutral factor. Only 12 (none declinees) felt that it was negative. It should be noted, however, that 79 responding were homeowners. The number of past family relocations was a signifi-

cant factor with 26 citing it as an influence to decline (including 3 declinees). Only 7 viewed it as an influence to accept command. 47 respondents indicated that their family influenced them to accept command, 33 stated their family's influence to be neutral and the remaining 18 (including 4 declinees) felt that their family's influence had been toward declination.

CHAPTER III

0-5 RESPONDENT DATA

General

At the time at which the list of FY 82 0-5 Command selectees was provided by MILPERCEN for this study, the following data applied. The initial FY 82 slate consisted of 286 commands and there were 55 new or unprogrammed commands. 28 of the 286 principal selectees declined command, 6 were deferred, 1 retired, 1 was promoted and 1 was given credit for a previous command. 107 alternates were activated, of whom 88 assumed command, 11 declined command and 8 were deferred. 264 responses were received and processed. 35 of 39 declinees responded.

The data is arrayed by question as expressed in the questionnaire utilized. Percentages are given for each response for each question for all 0-5 responses, 0-5 acceptees and 0-5 declinees. In those cases where significant numbers of responses were improperly marked and therefore out of range for the question involved, a comment is included and relative frequency percentages are displayed. In all other cases adjusted frequency percentages are displayed.

SPECIFIC STATISTICS (PERCENTAGES)

What is the source of your commission?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Service Academy	17.4	17.5	17.1
ROTC	64.4	66.4	51.4
OCS	16.7	14.4	31.4
Other/Direct	1.5	1.7	0

How many years commissioned service do you have (as of Dec 81)?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
21 or 22	3.0	2.6	5.7
19 or 20	17.8	16.2	28.6
17 or 18	47.0	47.2	45.7
15 or 16	29.2	31.0	17.1
14 or fewer	3.0	3.1	2.9

How many family members are currently living with you?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
6 to 7	2.7	2.6	2.9
4 to 5	30.7	31.0	28.6
2 to 3	53.4	52.4	60.0
1	8.3	9.2	2.9
Not applicable	4.9	4.8	5.7

How many family relocations have you made in the last 10 years?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
More than 10	0.8	0.9	0
9 or 10	4.6	4.0	8.6
7 or 8	14.2	13.7	17.1
5 or 6	54.0	56.2	40.0
3 or 4	24.9	23.9	31.4
2 or fewer	1.5	1.3	2.9

How old were you at your last birthday?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
45 to 49	2.7	1.7	8.6
40 to 44	59.8	58.5	68.6
35 to 39	37.5	39.7	22.9

Are you responding as an O-5 or O-6 Command Selectee?

	<u>All Responses%</u>
O-6	0
O-5	100.0

Indicate your sex.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Male	98.9	98.7	100.0
Female	1.1	1.3	0

How many below the zone promotions have you received?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
0	58.3	58.1	60.0
1	15.5	15.3	17.1
2	4.9	4.4	8.6
3	0.8	0.9	0

COMMENT: In all responses there were 54 improperly marked and dropped. Percentages shown reflect that fact.

How many years have passed since your last duty at battalion level or below?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
10 or more	16.7	15.7	22.9
7 to 9	12.5	11.8	17.1
4 to 6	33.0	34.5	22.9
2 to 3	28.8	27.9	34.3
1 or less	9.1	10.0	2.9

Are you a:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Primary command selectee	72.2	73.2	65.7
Alternate command selectee	27.8	26.8	34.3

What type unit were you selected to command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
TOE	70.9	70.4	74.3
TDA	27.6	28.3	22.9
Other	1.5	1.3	2.9

Which of the following categories best specifies the unit you were elected to command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Combat Arms	38.4	38.2	40.0
Combat Support Arms	24.0	23.7	25.7
Combat Service Support Arms	17.9	18.0	17.1
Training	16.0	16.2	14.3
Other	3.8	3.9	2.9

If you declined command, did you decline:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Prior to being selected	0	0	0
After selection, but before slating	1.5	0	11.4
After slating	11.7	0	88.6

NA, did not decline command	86.7	100	0
-----------------------------	------	-----	---

Would you characterize your primary reason for declining command as:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Personal	0.4	0	2.9
Professional	0.8	0	5.7
Family	3.8	0	25.7
Combination	8.0	0	60.0
Retirement	0	0	0
Other	0.8	0	5.7
N/A; I did not decline command	86.4	100	0

Do you plan to retire within the next year?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Yes	6.1	0	45.7
No	89.8	97.4	40.0
Undecided	4.2	2.6	14.3

Did you decide to retire (within the next year) before or after you were selected for command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Before	1.1	0.4	5.7
After	6.5	0.4	45.7
N/A; do not plan to retire within the next year	92.4	99.1	48.6

Did the command for which you were selected require a PCS?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Yes	90.4	89.4	97.1
No	9.6	10.6	2.9

How much time were you or would you have been allowed to accomplish the PCS?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
two weeks or less	10.3	11.0	5.7
15 days to a month	16.0	17.5	5.7
31 days to 90 days	15.2	14.9	17.1
more than 90 days	48.3	45.2	68.6
Selection for command did not require a PCS	10.3	11.4	2.9

How long did you remain at the location to which you were assigned prior to your command assignment, after the selection list was published?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
less than 1 year	41.2	43.9	23.5
1 to 2 years	42.7	41.2	52.9
more than 2 years	9.2	8.3	14.7
Did not PCS prior to command assignment	6.9	6.6	8.8

Please indicate when you were selected for command by a command selection board:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
1st consideration	48.5	51.1	31.4
2nd consideration	25.8	27.1	17.1
3rd consideration	9.8	7.9	22.9
4th consideration	4.5	4.8	2.9
5th consideration	1.9	1.7	2.9
Don't know	9.5	7.4	22.9

How did command fit in with your personal goals at the time of selection?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	2.7	0.4	17.1
Negative	4.6	4.8	2.9
Neutral	10.3	8.3	22.9
Positive	21.3	20.2	28.6
Very positive	61.2	65.2	28.6

What was the influence of your previous command experience on your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	0.8	0.9	0
Moderate influence to decline command	3.8	3.1	8.6
Neutral influence	17.5	13.6	42.9
Moderate influence to accept command	17.5	18.4	11.4
Strong influence to accept command	60.5	64.0	37.1

Did your personal health influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Yes	19.6	21.8	5.7
No	80.4	78.2	94.3

How did the command tour length influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	5.3	2.2	25.7
Moderate influence to decline command	15.2	13.5	25.7
Neutral influence	58.7	61.1	42.9
Moderate influence to accept command	11.4	13.1	0
Strong influence to accept command	9.5	10.0	5.7

How did the geographical location of the command influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	8.0	3.1	40.0
Moderate influence to decline command	7.6	7.0	11.4

Neutral influence	49.8	51.3	40.0
Moderate influence to accept command	19.0	21.1	5.7
Strong influence to accept command	15.6	17.5	2.9

How did your notion of the 06/05 level command environment affect your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	2.7	0.9	14.3
Moderate influence to decline command	14.4	11.8	31.4
Neutral influence	42.0	43.2	34.3
Moderate influence to accept command	21.2	2.7	11.4
Strong influence to accept command	14.8	15.7	8.6

COMMENT: 13 responses were improperly marked by acceptees and were dropped. All response and acceptee percentages reflect that fact.

How important was the timing of the offer of command in your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	14.1	7.0	60.0
Moderate influence to decline command	6.5	4.8	17.1
Neutral influence	43.0	46.5	20.0
Moderate influence to accept command	16.3	18.9	0
Strong influence to accept command	20.2	22.8	2.9

How did the type of command for which you were slated (as specified earlier in questions 11 and 12) influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	5.3	2.6	22.9
Moderate influence to decline command	7.6	7.0	11.4
Neutral influence	30.4	30.3	31.4
Moderate influence to accept command	17.5	20.2	0
Strong influence to accept command	39.2	39.9	34.3

Did the type of Command for which you were slated correspond with your initial or additional specialty?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Initial Specialty	82.1	80.7	91.4
Additional Specialty	10.3	11.0	5.7
Neither Specialty	7.6	8.3	2.9

How did the personality of the person or persons you would be working with affect your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	0.8	0	5.7
Moderate influence to decline command	3.1	2.2	8.6
Neutral influence	77.9	77.5	80.0
Moderate influence to accept command	11.1	12.8	0
Strong influence to accept command	7.3	7.5	5.7

How adequate was your previous military training and experience in preparing you for the type of command for which you were selected?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very inadequate	5.4	4.0	14.3
Inadequate	4.6	5.3	0
Neutral	6.9	6.6	8.6
Adequate	32.2	35.4	11.4
Very adequate	51.0	48.7	65.7

Did the presence of school-age family members in your household influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	12.9	7.0	51.4
Moderate influence to decline command	17.5	17.1	20.0
Neutral influence	43.3	46.9	20.0
Moderate influence to accept command	7.6	8.8	0
Strong influence to accept command	5.3	6.1	0
N/A; no school age family members	13.3	14.0	8.6

How did the health of family members influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	3.8	2.2	14.3
Moderate influence to decline command	6.8	6.1	11.4
Neutral influence	57.0	59.6	40.0
Moderate influence to accept command	4.2	4.8	0
Strong influence to accept command	4.6	4.8	2.9
N/A	23.6	22.4	31.4

How did your spouse's employment influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	3.4	3.1	5.7
Moderate influence to decline command	10.3	11.0	5.7
Neutral influence	34.2	34.2	34.3
Moderate influence to accept command	1.5	1.8	0
Strong influence to accept command	1.9	1.8	2.9
My spouse is not employed	43.7	43.9	42.9
I am not married	4.9	4.4	8.6

What is your immediate family's overall attitude toward the Army?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	0.4	0.4	0
Negative	6.1	5.7	8.8
Neutral	9.2	8.8	11.8
Positive	42.4	43.0	38.2
Very positive	38.5	38.6	38.2
Not applicable	3.4	3.5	2.9

What is your immediate family's attitude toward your being a commander at the time of your selection?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	0.8	0.9	0
Negative	4.9	3.9	11.4
Neutral	8.7	7.0	20.0
Positive	28.5	28.9	25.7
Very positive	53.6	55.7	40.0
Not applicable	3.4	3.5	2.9

What was your immediate family's attitude toward the geographical location of the command for which you were slated.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	10.6	7.4	31.4
Negative	17.0	17.5	14.3
Neutral	13.3	10.9	28.6
Positive	25.0	26.6	14.3
Very positive	30.3	34.1	5.7
Not applicable	3.8	3.5	5.7

Did your family directly influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	5.7	1.8	31.4
Moderate influence to decline command	10.6	7.9	28.6
Neutral influence	35.4	36.0	31.4
Moderate influence to accept command	23.6	26.8	2.9
Strong influence to accept command	20.9	24.1	0
N/A; I do not have immediate family members	3.8	3.5	5.7

How did owning a home influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	8.0	6.6	17.1
Moderate influence to decline command	12.2	10.5	22.9
Neutral influence	44.5	45.2	40.0
Moderate influence to accept command	2.3	2.6	0
Strong influence to accept command	0.8	0.9	0
N/A; I do not own a home	32.3	34.2	20.0

How did the number of relocations your family has made influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Strong influence to decline command	9.1	5.3	34.3
Moderate influence to decline command	16.7	16.2	20.0
Neutral influence	65.4	69.7	37.1
Moderate influence to accept command	3.4	3.5	2.9
Strong influence to accept command	1.5	1.8	0
N/A; I do not have a family to relocate	3.8	3.5	5.7

Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you did decline or would have declined command.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Lower than most	77.7	77.7	77.1
Same as peers	18.9	18.8	20.0
Higher than most	3.4	3.5	2.9

Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you did accept or would have accepted command.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Lower than most	0.8	0.9	0
Same as peers	22.0	23.6	11.4
Higher than most	77.3	75.5	88.6

Have those factors which influenced your decision to accept or decline command changed since you made your decision?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Not at all	77.1	75.3	88.6
Slightly	14.9	16.3	5.7
Moderately	7.3	7.9	2.9
Greatly	0.8	0.4	2.9
Very greatly	0	0	0

If you were permitted at this time to reconsider your decision to accept or decline command, would your decision be different or the same?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely the same	73.4	74.6	65.7
Probably the same	20.2	19.3	25.7
Not sure	2.7	2.2	5.7
Probably different	3.8	3.9	2.9
Definitely different	0	0	0

Should officers be permitted to decline consideration for command without adversely affecting subsequent personnel decisions?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely not	13.1	13.7	8.6
Probably not	14.9	16.3	5.7
Not sure	6.1	6.2	5.7
Probably yes	25.2	27.3	11.4
Definitely yes	40.8	36.6	68.6

Should an officer be allowed to decline command without prejudice after being slated for a particular command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely not	26.6	30.3	2.9
Probably not	28.1	30.3	14.3
Not sure	5.3	4.8	8.6
Probably yes	21.3	21.9	17.1
Definitely yes	18.6	12.7	57.1

How do you feel about publication of the Centralized Command Selection List:

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Should be published	78.4	79.9	68.6
Should not be published	9.8	8.3	20.0
No opinion	11.7	11.8	11.4

What is your opinion of the selection notification procedure?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	10.2	8.7	20.0
Negative	12.1	10.9	20.0
Neutral	30.3	30.6	28.6
Positive	36.7	38.9	22.9
Very positive	10.6	10.9	8.6

Indicate your perception regarding the Centralized Command Selection System (CCSS) vs. the "Old Boy Net" for selecting commanders.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Old Boy Net is best	7.3	7.5	5.7
Both are the same	12.6	11.0	22.9
The CCSS is best	80.2	81.5	71.4

Did you decline command because you believed that you could make a greater contribution to the Army in a noncommand job?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Yes	1.5	0	11.4
No	11.8	0.4	85.7
N/A; I did not decline command	86.6	99.6	0

COMMENT: One decline response was mismarked and dropped.

Indicate your feeling about the current command tour length.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	4.5	3.9	8.6
Negative	26.1	24.9	34.3
Neutral	20.1	19.2	25.7
Positive	33.3	34.5	25.7
Very positive	15.9	17.5	5.7

How would you feel about being required to complete a full command tour after receiving a promotion? (Commanding a battalion-sized unit as an 06 or a brigade as an 07)?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Very negative	23.2	21.9	31.4
Negative	32.3	32.5	31.4
Neutral	15.6	15.4	17.1
Positive	20.5	21.1	17.1
Very positive	8.4	9.2	2.9

Should the Centralized Command Selection System be modified to permit MACOM Commanders to have more influence in the slating of selectees for specific command?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Definitely not	16.3	18.0	5.7
Probably not	25.5	27.2	14.3
Not sure	18.3	18.0	20.0
Probably yes	31.6	29.4	45.7
Definitely yes	8.4	7.5	14.3

What is your branch? Please enter the two digit code as shown below with the first digit shown in column 1 and the second digit in column 2 of item 54.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Infantry	18.8	17.3	28.6
Armor	10.7	11.5	5.7
Field Artillery	11.9	12.8	5.7
Air Defense Artillery	5.7	5.3	8.6
Engineer	7.3	7.5	5.7
Signal	6.5	6.2	8.6
Military Police	4.6	4.4	5.7
Military Intelligence	8.8	8.4	11.4
Ordnance	8.8	8.4	11.4
Quartermaster	3.8	3.5	5.7
Adjutant General	3.1	3.5	0
Medical Service	0.8	0.9	0
Aviation	1.9	1.8	2.9
Transportation	6.1	7.1	0
Chemical	1.1	1.3	0

What is your initial (primary) specialty as specified in DA PAM 600-3?

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
11	16.7	15.4	25.7
12	11.0	11.8	5.7
13	12.5	13.6	5.7
14	6.5	6.1	8.6
15	3.4	3.1	5.7
21	6.8	7.0	5.7
22	0.4	0.4	0
25	6.1	5.7	8.6
31	4.6	4.4	5.7
35	3.4	3.5	2.9
36	1.1	0.9	2.9
37	4.2	3.9	5.7
41	0.8	0.9	0
42	1.9	2.2	0
51	0.4	0.4	0
54	0.8	0.9	0
71	1.5	1.8	0
73	1.1	1.3	0
74	0.8	0.9	0
75	2.3	2.6	0

81	0.8	0.9	0
87	0.4	0.4	0
8	0.4	0.4	0
1	4.9	3.9	11.4
2	3.<	3.1	5.7
5	3.4	3.9	0

Indicate your highest level of civilian education.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Bachelor's Degree	8.7	8.3	11.4
Some Graduate Study	9.9	7.9	22.9
Master's Degree	79.1	81.1	65.7
Doctor's Degree	1.9	2.2	0
Other	0.4	0.4	0

Indicate your highest level of military education.

	<u>All Responses%</u>	<u>Acceptees%</u>	<u>Declinees%</u>
Advanced Course	1.1	0.9	2.9
C&GSC or equivalent	94.3	94.7	91.4
SSC	2.7	2.6	2.9
Other	1.9	1.8	2.9

0-5 Profile

In each of the next questions, indicate the position on the scale that best represents your feelings about your last command assignment.

Too Long	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Short
Good for Promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not good for promotion
High Risk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Low Risk
Dream Come True	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Nightmare
Necessary for Promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not necessary for Promotion
Made a Contribution to the Army	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Did not make a Contribution to the Army
What you Entered the Army for	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not what you Entered the Army for
Was Permitted to do your own thing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Was not Permitted to do your own thing
Great for my Family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad for my Family
Was a Prestigious Assignment	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Was not a Prestigious Assignment

NOTE: _____ Acceptees
 _____ Declinees

Discussion

Demographic data for the respondents will be discussed first. Sources of commission for respondents appeared to be unremarkably distributed but 11 out of 44 responding with an OCS background declined command (31.4% OCS declinees versus 14.4% OCS acceptees.) Declinees were slightly older and had a little more commissioned service than

acceptees. Family sizes for both groups were about the same with 33.4% of all respondents having four or more family members in their household. Only 3 respondents were female and none of them had declined command. 72.2% of all those responding were primary selectees versus 27.8% alternates and percentages for acceptees and declinees were similar. 62% of all O-5 selectees had not served at battalion level or lower for 4 or more years. For 30% the period had been 7 or more years. Declinees had been away from troops for a little longer period than acceptees. About 74% of all those responding have had 5 or more family relocations in the last 10 years and about 20% have had 7 or more. 73.3% of all respondents had received no below the zone promotions and percentages for acceptees and declinees did not differ significantly. Branch and specialty distributions for respondents were displayed in the earlier specific statistical section. It is noted for this year's selectees that 11 of 49 infantry selectees declined command.

Next the respondents' views of various aspects of the command selection system will be examined. 51% of O-5 selectees responding had not been picked during their first consideration for command. Declinees tended to be selected on a later consideration than acceptees. The timing of the offer of command was an important factor in the decision to decline with 60% of the declinees citing it as a strong influence to decline and 17.1% as a moderate influence to decline. 79.5% of all those responding think the Centralized Command Selection System is superior to the old method for command selection and 78.4% believe the selection list should be published. Percentages for declinees in these two categories are slightly lower. A significant level of discontent with selection notification procedures was noted with less than half of all those responding viewing it positively. 40% of declinees had a

negative opinion of the procedure. Declinees were more inclined to modify the command selection system to permit greater MACOM participation than acceptees with 60% of declinees favoring such modification versus 36.7% of acceptees.

When queried regarding their willingness to remain in command to tour length completion following promotion, over half of all respondents (55.5%) answered negatively and only 28.8% indicated a positive response.

A significant level of negative feelings was noted regarding the 30 ± 6 month command tour length, with 30.6% of all respondents indicating that they viewed it negatively and only 49.2% giving it a positive rating. 42.9% of declinees responded negatively to the same question.

Declinees indicated that 11.4% had declined command after selection but before slating, while the remaining 88.6% declined after slating. 63.9% of acceptees and 80% of declinees believe a selectee should be allowed to decline command prior to slating with no adverse effect. After slating, however, only 34.6% of acceptees believe declination should be allowed without prejudice, while 74.2% of declinees responded similarly.

The majority of all responding feel that their chances for promotion will be decreased if they decline command (77.7%) and increased if they accept (77.3%). Acceptees and declinees generally agree on these points.

Last, rationale for acceptance or declination will be considered. 25.7% of those declining indicated that their primary reasons for declination were family connected, while 60% cited a combination of reasons. 45.7% of declinees planned to retire within the next year with 14.3%

undecided. 45.7% of these decided to retire only after selection for command.

Most of all those responding were slated for a command requiring a PCS (90.4%) with 41.4% of them being allowed 90 days or less to accomplish the move. Interestingly enough, decliners had a slightly better situation than all respondents with only 28.6% being given 90 days or less.

86.2% of the acceptees stated that command fit positively into their personal goals when offered versus 57.2% of the decliners. 82.4% of acceptees and 48.5% of decliners felt that their prior command experiences were a positive influence to accept.

Only 5.7% of decliners noted personal health as influencing their decision, while 21.8% of acceptees had been influenced by the same factor.

As noted earlier, command tour length was viewed negatively by some. 51.4% of decliners and 15.7% of acceptees indicated it was a factor influencing declination.

The geographical location of the command was a significant factor influencing declination with 51.4% of the decliners viewing it as such.

Only 10.1% of the acceptees viewed it similarly. 45.7% of decliners were influenced to decline based upon their notion of the command environment while acceptees were considerably lower.

34.3% of the decliners were influenced to decline command by the type of command offered while only 9.6% of the acceptees were similarly influenced.

A significant proportion of the factors influencing acceptance or declination of command are family related and will be discussed together. The presence of school age children is viewed as a significant

influence to decline. (24.1% of all responses and 71.4% of declinees). Health of family members influenced 25.7% of the declinees toward rejection of command. Spouse's employment was considered a factor toward declination for 13.7% of all those responding and as a neutral influence by 34.2%. Declinee responses were similar to acceptees for this question. Respondents' families attitudes toward both the Army and command selection were positive for both acceptees and declinees. Family attitudes towards the geographical location of the command offered mirrored the earlier discussed respondents' views on the same subject. 45.7% of the declinees and 24.9% of the acceptees families viewed it as a negative influence. Homeownership is an important factor with 67.7% of all respondents indicating that they were homeowners. 40% of the declinees stated that homeownership influenced them toward declination. The number of family relocations experienced was another significant factor influencing toward declination. 54.3% of declinees rated it as such versus 17.1% of acceptees. Perhaps as significant, only 2.9% of declinees and 3.5% of acceptees saw it as a positive influence. Based upon all of these family related factors, it is no surprise that 60% of the declinees stated that their families directly influenced them toward declination versus 9.6% of the acceptees.

CHAPTER IV

CGSC RESPONDENT DATA

General

As previously mentioned, input from CGSC level officers was sought to determine if attitudes reflected by younger officers were consistent with 05 and 06 level respondents. 297 questionnaires from this group were analyzed. Respondents were drawn from two CGSC class divisions. Only officers in OPMS managed specialties were asked to complete the questionnaire.

The following shows data from the CGSC class arrayed by questions as expressed in the questionnaire utilized. Percentages are given for responses for each question for all CGSC respondents. In those cases where significant numbers of responses were improperly marked and therefore out of range for the question involved, a comment is included and negative frequency percentages are displayed. In all other cases, adjusted frequency percentages are displayed.

SPECIFIC STATISTICS (PERCENTAGES)

What is the source of your commission?

	<u>%</u>
Service Academy	10.4
ROTC	44.4
OCS	40.1
Other/Direct	5.1

How many years commissioned service do you have as of Dec. '81?

	<u>%</u>
14 or more	38.4
12 to 14	43.1
10 to 12	7.2
8 to 10	1.0
6 to 8	0.3
less than 6	0

How many family members are currently living with you?

	<u>%</u>
8 or more	0
6 or 7	1.3
4 or 5	24.2
2 or 3	57.6
1	7.1
None	9.8

How many family relocations have you made while in the Army?

	<u>%</u>
More than 10	41.4
8 or 9	25.6
6 or 7	19.5
4 or 5	9.1
2 or 3	2.7
less than 2	1.0

How many below the zone promotions have you received?

	<u>%</u>
0	86.5
1	13.1
2 or more	0.4

Indicate your highest level of civilian education.

	<u>%</u>
High School	0
Some College	0
Bachelor's degree	26.9
master's degree	71.4
Doctor's degree	1.7
Other	0

How many years have passed since your last duty at Battalion level or lower?

	<u>%</u>
1	24.7
2	7.8
3	11.5
4	14.2

5 or more	39.5
I have never served at that level.	2.4

What type unit would you prefer to command?

	<u>%</u>
Combat Arms	52.0
Combat Support	20.7
Combat Service Support	20.7
TRADOC Training Unit	1.7
Other	1.4
None	3.4

Indicate your sex.

	<u>%</u>
Male	99.0
Female	1.0

How old were you at your last birthday?

	<u>%</u>
40 or older	8.4
34 through 39	76.1
30 through 34	15.5
27 through 29	0
26 or younger	0

Indicate your grade.

	<u>%</u>
O-3	.3
O-4	98.6
O-5	1.0

How does command fit in with your future personal goals?

	<u>%</u>
Very negative	0.7
Negative	8.8
Neutral	15.2
Positive	23.6
Very positive	51.9
N/A	

At this point to what extent do you think your previous command experience would influence your decision to accept or decline battalion command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	1.0
Moderate to decline command	7.7
Neutral	9.8
Moderate to accept command	20.5
Strong to accept command	58.9
N/A	2.0

Do you currently plan to retire before completing a 30 year career?

	<u>%</u>
Yes	41.9
No	15.5
Undecided	42.6

Do you consider the current (30+6 mth.) Battalion command tour length to be:

	<u>%</u>
Too long	58.2
About right	36.7
Too short	0.7
No opinion	4.4

How adequate has your military training and experience thus far been in preparing you for ultimate Battalion Command?

	<u>%</u>
Very inadequate	5.1
Inadequate	12.1
Neutral	7.7
Adequate	46.1
Very adequate	28.3
No opinion	.7

What is your family's current attitude toward the Army?

	<u>%</u>
Very negative	2.7
Negative	6.1
Neutral	14.5
Positive	45.1
Very positive	27.6
N/A	4.0

If you were offered a command today, how would your family's attitude influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Not at all	25.1
Toward declining command	18.3
Toward accepting command	56.6

Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you decline an offered Battalion command?

	<u>%</u>
Lower than most	72.1
Same as peers	23.9
Higher than most	4.0

Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you accept an offered Battalion command?

	<u>%</u>
Lower than most	1.0
Same as peers	25.5
Higher than most	73.5

Should officers be permitted to decline consideration for command without adversely affecting subsequent personnel decisions?

	<u>%</u>
Definitely not	8.8
Probably not	10.1
Not sure	6.7
Probably yes	22.6
Definitely yes	51.2
No opinion	0.7

Should an officer be allowed to decline command without prejudice after being slated for a particular command?

	<u>%</u>
Definitely not	15.8
Probably not	29.0
Not sure	9.4
Probably yes	21.2
Definitely yes	23.2
No opinion	1.3

How do you feel about publication of the Centralized Command Selection List?

	<u>%</u>
Should be published	84.1
Should not be published	15.9

Indicate your perception regarding the Centralized Command Selection System (CCSS) versus the previous system whereby battalion commanders were selected by local senior commanders?

	<u>%</u>
CCSS best	62.6
Both the same	13.6
Old system best	23.8

Would you decline command if you believed that you could make a greater contribution to the Army in a non command job?

	<u>%</u>
Yes	47.1
No	24.2
Don't know	28.6

In your speciality do you feel that Battalion command is necessary for career success?

	<u>Σ</u>
Yes	64.0
No	31.3
Don't know	4.7

Which type of assignment listed below would enable you to make the greatest contribution to the total Army?

	<u>Σ</u>
No comment	4.7
Secondary ASI	11.2
Command/Leadership	59.7
DA/MACOM STAFF	16.3
Other	8.1

What is your branch? Please select the appropriate branch (by two digit code).

	<u>Σ</u>
Infantry	23.8
Armor	9.2
Field Artillery	13.3
Air Defense Artillery	3.4
Engineer	9.5
Signal	6.5
Military Police	2.0
Military Intelligence	5.8
Ordnance	6.5
Quartermaster	3.1
Adjutant General	4.4
Medical Service	3.1
Aviation	2.7
Transportation	4.1
Chemical	0.3
Other	2.4

What is your initial (primary) specialty? Enter only the two digit code as specified in DA PAM 600-3.

<u>Specialty</u>	<u>Σ</u>
11	19.9
12	8.1
13	13.5
14	3.7
15	5.4
21	9.1
25	5.4
31	1.3
32	0.3
33	0.3
35	3.0
36	2.0
37	1.0

41	1.3
42	2.7
44	0.3
45	0.3
46	0.3
52	0.3
53	0.3
54	1.3
55	0.3
60	0.7
63	0.3
67	2.7
71	1.0
72	0.3
73	0.3
74	0.3
75	1.7
81	0.3
91	4.0
92	3.0
95	2.7

If your wife is career oriented would her career requirements influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Yes	30.1
No	19.9
Not married	5.7
Wife not career oriented	44.3

Please answer the following questions assuming that you have been selected for battalion command at an appropriate time in the future.

How would command tour length (30+6 months) influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	8.3
Moderate to decline command	22.5
Neutral	41.5
Moderate to accept command	13.8
Strong to accept command	13.8
N/A	

Would slating for Battalion Command in an unaccompanied tour area influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	12.1
Moderate to decline command	12.5
Neutral	40.1
Moderate to accept command	11.4
Strong to accept command	23.9

Would slating for Battalion Command in an appropriate CONUS TO & E battalion influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	3.0
Moderate to decline command	5.7
Neutral	38.1
Moderate to accept command	19.2
Strong to accept command	34.0

Would slating for Battalion Command in an appropriate USAREUR TO&E battalion influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	7.1
Moderate to decline command	10.8
Neutral	32.4
Moderate to accept command	17.2
Strong to accept command	32.7

Would slating for Battalion Command in TDA Training battalion influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	12.1
Moderate to decline command	17.8
Neutral	39.4
Moderate to accept command	17.5
Strong to accept command	13.1

If given your choice as to the type of battalion you would command, please indicate your first choice.

	<u>%</u>
TO&E unit appropriate to branch and speciality	84.5
TDA unit appropriate to branch and speciality	9.4
Other	3.4
None	2.7

Would timing of the offer of command influence your decision to accept or decline command if you were given 30 days or less in which to prepare to assume the command assignment from time of notification.

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	13.5
Moderate to decline command	17.5
Neutral	46.2
Moderate to accept command	9.1
Strong to accept command	13.8

Would timing of the offer of command influence your decision to accept or decline command if you were given 6 months or more in which to prepare to assume the command assignment from time of notification.

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	0.7
Moderate to decline command	2.0
Neutral	31.6
Moderate to accept command	21.2
Strong to accept command	44.4

If you owned a home at a significant distance from the location of the offered command, how would it influence your decision to accept or decline command.

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	5.7
Moderate to decline command	13.8
Neutral	62.3
Moderate to accept command	7.7
Strong to accept command	10.4

Would moving your children between elementary schools in CONUS during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	11.1
Moderate to decline command	26.3
Neutral	27.6
Moderate to accept command	9.4
Strong to accept command	10.1
N/A	15.5

Would moving your children between high schools in CONUS in the summer influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	5.7
Moderate to decline command	12.1
Neutral	33.0
Moderate to accept command	13.1
Strong to accept command	19.5
N/A	16.5

Would moving your children between high schools in CONUS during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	18.6
Moderate to decline command	29.4
Neutral	23.3
Moderate to accept command	5.7
Strong to accept command	8.1
N/A	14.9

Would moving your children between elementary schools from CONUS to USAREUR in the summer influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	5.1
Moderate to decline command	4.1
Neutral	40.0
Moderate to accept command	12.5
Strong to accept command	24.4
N/A	13.9

Would moving your children between elementary schools from CONUS to USAREUR during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	15.9
Moderate to decline command	26.4
Neutral	26.8
Moderate to accept command	7.8
Strong to accept command	9.8
N/A	13.2

Would moving your children between high schools from CONUS to USAREUR in the summer influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	10.2
Moderate to decline command	14.6
Neutral	30.8
Moderate to accept command	11.5
Strong to accept command	16.9
N/A	15.9

Would moving your children between high schools from CONUS to USAREUR during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	26.4
Moderate to decline command	27.1
Neutral	19.3
Moderate to accept command	4.7
Strong to accept command	9.8
N/A	12.5

Would a requirement to place your children in a USAREUR boarding school environment influence your decision to accept or decline command?

	<u>%</u>
Strong to decline command	55.7
Moderate to decline command	15.5
Neutral	12.2

Moderate to accept command	2.7
Strong to accept command	2.4
N/A	11.5

CGSC PROFILE

In each of the next question, indicate the position on the scale that best represents your feelings about your last command assignment.

Too long	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Too Short
Good for Promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not good for Promotion
High Risk	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Low Risk
Dream Come True	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Nightmare
Necessary for Promotion	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not necessary for Promotion
Made a Contribution to the Army	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Did not make a Contribution to the Army
What you Entered the Army for	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not what you Entered the Army for
Was Permitted to do your own thing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Was not Permitted to do your own thing
Great for my Family	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Bad for my Family
Was a Prestigious Assignment	1	2	3	4	5	6	6	Was not a Prestigious Assignment

Discussion

76.1% of the CGSC respondents were between 34 and 39 years of age. Almost 90% were commissioned from sources other than service academies. 61.6% had 14 years of service or less and 98.6% were in grade O-4. Two or three family members living at home was reflected by 57.6% of respondents, while 24.2% had four or five. 41.4% of the group has had more than 10 family relocations since entering service. Masters degrees are

held by 71.4% of the CGSC respondents.

It is interesting to note that 75.5% of the respondents reflected positive responses to command as a future goal and 79.4% indicate previous command experience would influence their decision favorably to accept battalion command. Yet, 42.6% indicated they were undecided about retiring before completing a 30 year career. Family attitudes are indicated as positive toward the Army and as an influence toward accepting a future command. 72.7% responded positively to the former and 56% to the latter. Additionally, 19.9% responded that a career oriented wife would not influence the command decision and 44.3% indicated their wives were not career oriented.

Factors which apparently will impact significantly on the accept or decline decision will be reviewed next. Because the CGSC respondent will normally only view battalion command, it is interesting to note that 39.5% of the respondents have not had duty at battalion level in five or more years. 46.1% of CGSC respondents feel their training and experience thus far have provided an adequate basis for command with 28.3% considering it very adequate. Promotion potential is clearly viewed as enhanced by command. 73.5% indicate battalion command will raise their chances for promotion higher than most. The Centralized Command Selection System (CCSS) is seen by 62.6% of respondents as the best approach. 64% of the respondents thought command was necessary for career success in their specialty and 59.7% indicated command would enable to make their greatest contribution to the total Army.

Potential negative factors included a wide range of areas. 58.2% consider 30 \pm 6 month command tours too long, 30.8% feel tour length is an influence toward declination. 47.1% responded they would decline

command if they believed they could make a greater contribution in a non-command job. The issue of declination of command yielded responses which indicate 73.8% thought officers should be permitted to decline command without adversely affecting subsequent personnel decisions. Further, 44.4% felt an officer should be allowed to decline command without prejudice after being slated for a particular job. The slating process itself yielded generally neutral responses, however 29.9% indicated a TDA training battalion would influence them toward declination and only 9.4% indicated a preference for TDA command. If given 30 days or less in which to prepare to assume command 30% indicated influence toward declination. In contrast, a 6 month preparation period produced 65.6% influence toward acceptance. Homeownership was not a major issue among CGSC respondents. School disruptions among dependent children yielded strong negative results. Predominantly influencing toward declination were mid-year moves for children of all ages, but particularly high school age. Mid year moves to Europe for high school age children drew the most negative responses, with 53.5% indicating an influence to decline under those conditions. Boarding school requirements in Europe would influence 71.3% to decline command.

CHAPTER V

O-6 WRITTEN COMMENTS

This chapter sets forth the narrative comments received from the Colonels who responded to the survey. The comments have been condensed in some cases for purposes of organization and readability. Our purpose is to record the breadth and depth of concern registered by the respondents while maintaining reasonable length.

The percentage of respondents raising a particular issue is reflected in the chart below. These numbers are, in our view, less reliable than the numerical data derived from the questionnaire because there was no effort to control choices or to seek specific comments. However, these data do provide a good "common sense" check on the analysis provided above, since approximately 75% of the respondents included written comments.

1. Adverse effect on the family	44%
2. Adverse effect on children's education	35%
3. Inadequate return for effort expended and risks taken	28%
4. Adverse effect on wife's career	27%
5. Excessive command tour length	22%
6. The process of slating for a command	20%
7. Centralized Command Selection System	18%
8. Attraction of Retirement	16%
9. Undesirable Command Environment	16%
10. Type Unit - TO & E vs. TFA vs. Other	14%
11. Desirability of Current Assignment	13%
12. Inappropriate Timing	11%
13. Insufficient Pay	11%
14. Undesirable Oversea Location	11%
15. Undesirable Location (Other than Oversea)	10%

16. Health	6%
17. Inadequate Housing	5%
18. Cutbacks in Military Benefits	1%
19. Opposed to DECLINATION (Respondents who commented against declination)	13%

Adverse effects upon the officer's family were the most significant disincentives to accepting command responsibility among the officers who provided written comments in response to the survey. This issue has many facets. Schooling for children, health of family members, stress due to repeated moves, obligations of the commander's spouse, and frequent separations have disparate impacts, and where the issues can be treated separately they have been. However, the officers who raised these issues (and over half did) tended to lump the more specific family problems together.

The views of an officer with professional experience in dealing with this type problem describe the issues raised most often.

"I spent two years in the COLs' assignments business at MILPERCEN '78-'80. My current situation is no different than the majority of 06 who declined command then -- all the following impact in my current age group:

- (1) 3 kids in college
- (2) wife works
- (3) have an expensive house to unload on a very lousy market.

I plan to go to command, but if I do not sell my house I will be faced with an almost insurmountable financial situation -- there is not enough cash flow to finance 3 college aged kids (who also work) and still pay the bills. The days of packing mama and the baby up, picking up my foot locker and moving out are over for us -- and a lot of other Army folks in today's environment. I did not sign up for the money but it is nice to break even and give the kids a chance -- its as simple as that with me."

"But more than economics is involved."

"The single consideration that I was faced with was leaving teenage kids, one of which was in college, and coming to Korea to command. Commanding without the family being near is tough, but many have selected Korea over long command tours elsewhere. My position was simply this: I had worked for 22 years for a brigade command and everything else including the

family came second to being able to command. I don't regret the decision and will stay in command for 18 months without dependants even though my family is terribly depressed and disappointed.

"Some empathized with the family's predicament."

"Based on my personal beliefs I see command time (based on when you get it) as coming at one of the toughest family times. In my case, most of my children were high school age and I honestly gave more time to my battalion than I did to my family. So my wife picked up the leadership of the house since I was more often than not at the battalion, or in the field or in alert etc. Upcoming O-6 command comes when the children are in college and leaving the home so there is considerable stress there as well. So why did I stay? Its simply a question of serving. My wife says I put the US Army over her and the family and I just hate to admit that she's right, but she probably is. I could have gotten a new decent paying job before taking O-6 and SSC but I opted for the Army."

Others didn't.

"If I were to succumb to my spouse's desires for a "normal life," home, stability, good schools, etc, etc, a life that does not demand her role as "the CO's wife," I would retire ASAP. So far I've resisted!"

But most officers viewed the problem as inevitable, while being quick to add that the Army should do more to minimize family trauma.

"I believe that by far the biggest contributor to declinations is the family. Unfortunately, most of us get command about the time our children are in the critical high school years when a sudden move can be (or be preceived as) tramatic. Don't believe there is any pat solution to this dilemma. We, the system, must make these moves as compatable as possible to family plans while still meeting the needs of the Army."

The influence of the spouse's career was cited frequently, 27%, but this presently is less of a problem than it is likely to be in the future when the growing trend of working wives has a greater impact on the military. One officer elaborated on this issue:

"I truly believe that the working wife has a lot to do with officers accepting or declining command. In my own case my wife had a tremendous job in the Washington, D.C. area. The chances of her moving up the corporate ladder were significant. She was just beginning to get involved at the management level when we received word that we would be coming to Germany for command. There were some serious discussions

in our household as to whether or not I should decline command and look for something else to do so that she could continue on with her career, or whether or not she should vacate her just beginning career and continue to support me as she has done during the last 20+ years. In this day and age when many wives are working, and the vast majority of senior O5s or O6s have at least one or more children in college the additional income is almost a necessity in order to make ends meet. To give up the additional income that keeps the kids in college, or helps pay the house note has a significant bearing on whether or not officers accept or decline command."

Schooling for family members was cited more frequently than any other specific cause as a reason for declination (35%). Moreover, it was apparent that several officers who did not decline were on the brink of doing so for this reason. For example:

"I was to assume command in the summer of 1982. The location of command was to be in Germany. It so happened that my son (17) - who had a health related disability - was to graduate from high school and enter college in 1982. My wife and I were concerned about his ability to handle the transition. My request for deferment was granted."

"Frankly, if my request for deferral had been denied, I do not believe that I could have accepted in good conscience a command so far from personal obligations. My son and all my family have made considerable sacrifices during my career. This time it was my turn to sacrifice."

"The Army was reasonable with me and my family. In turn, I was prepared to accept any command in any location once having the opportunity to get my son through his first year of college. In short, my response would have been very different had the Army not been willing to consider favorable my request for deferral."

And: Although I accepted command [one] of the factors that I considered which would have caused me to decline command [was]:

a. My command was located in Europe thus:

1. I must move my son in his last year of high school and will jeopardize his chances for receiving an athletic scholarship.

And: It was a very difficult decision because I wanted [my] son to stay in a high school more than one year prior to graduation.

Although officers are resigned to some family distress due to their assumption of command, they are not resigned to what can be character-

ized, perhaps simplistically, as the MILPERCEN problem. This includes the administration of the CCSS, slating for specific commands, timing of moves, and attendant notification of the officers concerned. To these problems the officer corps is unabashedly hostile. The attitudes appear among the declinees as well as those who accept command responsibility. However, because declinees are dealt with in a following paragraph, the objections that follow are from officers who chose to accept command notwithstanding their feeling toward "MILPERCEN."

The slating process may be working well from the manager's perspective, but from the selectee's point of view the operation is a failure.

"The command notification process is abysmal and totally insensitive to providing the type of specific data needed upon which to base many personal or professional decisions. Command notification/slating to a specific command should be a package deal. MILPERCEN parcels out "pieces of stress" for months on end. Only my firm commitment to truly wanting troop duty keeps me in line. I am accepting in spite of the system!"

And: "For "general comments," let me replay a scenario from the 1981 Command List. To me, it typifies the worst in personnel management. I was in the Class of 80 at the AWC along with eleven other Signal Officers. That was the year of the expanded command tour length, and publication of the list for 81 was necessarily delayed. When it did appear in late spring, none of the "Carlisle 12" were primary but six or seven of us were alternate. There were six available O-6 commands for Signal in 81, however, it was common knowledge that the Echelons Above Corps reorganization was being approved and implemented and two new Signal Brigades would be activated in FY 81, thus increasing the number of commands to eight. Still, only six names appeared on the primary list. When we questioned the Assignments Branch, we were told "not to worry," we were so far down on the alternate list that we would not be activated for 81. We were told this separately and repeatedly. To shorten the story, we graduated, went our separate ways, bought houses, went to work and then -- within 3 weeks in my case -- were notified that we were activated and must report to Europe on 1 Feb 81. There were lots and lots of turn-downs. If I had not been operationally deferred, I would have probably turned it down too, and lost my opportunity to do what I most wanted. Why?? I felt betrayed by the Army that I had served for more than 20 years. My family and I have expected frequent moves which were expensive and -- for the kids -- often heart rending. My oldest son was an eighth

grader before he ever attended the same school in successive years. The key, however, was necessity. For the good of the Army. I understood, and they accepted it."

"When one undertakes to set down feelings such as these, there is the risk of being interpreted as being over emotional, reactionary, unrealistic, selfish and many other things considered unattractive for an Army Officer. I wish to point out, however, that we are conditioned to deal on principle as well as fact. Integrity as practiced on a personal basis by officers reflects the corporate body of the Army. When the corporate body chooses to unnecessarily ignore principles (in the eye of the beholder), and operate in a callous, unfeeling manner, it raises the hackles and causes unpredictable personal reactions. So the real answer as to why I would have turned down command is not simple. The feeling of betrayal -- real or imagined -- was the determinant. "If thats the way the Army wants to operate, they can keep it!" would probably best express my attitude in July 1980. I was rescued by a highly principled and feeling local command chain."

"A better managed program could have averted what was very nearly a total "turn off" of a loyal Army family. As stated, the Army knew of the pending requirement for additional commanders. Would it not have been logical to put those positions on the primary list, and name the commanders prior to the close of SSC and the exodus of a large part of the alternate list? I submit that this matter could and should have been resolved in time to avert a double move with the inherent hardships to any family. We (my family) would not have objected in the least to remaining at Carlisle and taking a PCS directly to Germany in February '81. I'm sure others would have had similar feelings. For the purposes of your study, you should get Colonel's Branch to drag out the list of alternates who turned down the job."

"The results are history, but I shall always remember the time the Army needlessly put me into a box."

And: "Total disregard for you and your family. I was made to feel that if I was not willing to stop what I was doing and move in two weeks that there were ten equally qualified Colonels eager to take my place. The Army has the wrong attitude. This is a time for the Army to give some consideration to personal desires. Why not?"

And: "Taking a command often is a traumatic event for the family. When I was selected for battalion command I was notified the end of May that I would attend the PCC during the summer, Monterey in the fall, and depart for Germany in mid-November. The family was on the road from August until just prior to Christmas. The schools in both places I was stationed in Germany assured that my children were almost one year behind their peers upon our return to CONUS."

And: "I was selected for brigade command at the War College and was notified almost two years prior to the change of command. One year later, after an intermediate PCS, and after some financial and family decisions based upon the location of the command, I was notified that the command had been changed, I was to go to a different port, six months earlier."

"The point is that the family has been sacrificed for my career -- constant moves, no equity, bad schools, poor quarters. Consideration for my family will take a higher priority in my future decisions."

The design of the CCSS system was not the object of antagonistic comments, but suggestions for approval were offered frequently:

"I fully understand that without CCSS I may never have gotten the opportunity to command - I was a first time selectee at O5 and a second time selectee at O6. However, I believe we may have gone to an extreme and maybe a modified "Old Boy Net" is the answer. Require officers to either accept or decline consideration before boards are held and evaluate those who seek command. Circulate the list of officers seeking command to general officers on active duty and ask them to annotate the list with not more than six officers they would want to have command one of their subordinate units. Complete the board action. Require selected officers to accept command or retire within six months. Give MACOM commanders a larger role in the slating process. Boards should select commanders only in primary specialties - the other way is a farce. Stop dual boards for PMs and others."

"CCSS - must be modified by "Old Boy Net" to select the "best" officer for command."

"MILPERCEN assignment officers must have more latitude in slating, i.e., OPMD and DCSPER hands down ground rules that do not recognize putting best commander in best command position."

"CMD selection is just too secretive. Make the selection and announce it. Let assignment officers do slating in conjunction with officer and needs of the service. Keep generals out of it, or return to the "Old Boy" Net. Do in peacetime what you do in war. By this I mean few know who replacement CDR's will be. An officer and command selectee should be able to perform if he is properly selected and qualified."

"To cut declination rate, boards should consider only those who desire command, and in the year they desire it. In other words, "sign up" if you want to be considered."

"Old Boy Net" was best. Present system will stand test of courts for impartiality, which is a prime MILPERCEN concern."

Never mind that it is wasteful. I have spent one year in an excess interim assignment after SSC waiting for command. Better utilization would have sent me to a proper O6 slot for three years, and let "Old Boy" (your term - I call him a career manager) slot me for command on normal rotation."

"My case may be unique in that I was selected as an alternate for O6 command on the FY 80 lists - I was then stationed in OSD. I then was selected for AWC (class of '80). I was not activated for FY 80, and while at AWC was not selected as either principal or alternate for the FY 81 and command list. After this strong indication that O6 command was not to be had, I selected a position at the school where my 3-4 year tenure could provide much needed continuity in training developments. To my surprise and initial chagrin, I was selected as a primary on the FY 82 command list. This meant leaving in the summer of '82 and pulling my youngest son from high school for his senior year. I almost declined command over this or considered family separation for him to complete high school. We have decided to move him for his senior year -- not an easy or enjoyable decision."

"There should be continuity in the selection process, i.e., if once selected by a board as an alternate, one should remain an alternate until selected or notified that you are no longer considered for O6 command. More personal planning would then be accomplished and carried out!"

Failure to obtain a TO&E command was a source of disappointment to many colonels who responded, although few commented in detail on the matter. One officer stated his views as follows:

"When I received slating for a TRADOC school command not one person in the HQ congratulated me. When it was changed to a prestigious TOE combat unit -- everyone locally (and even telephonically) offered congratulations!"

"I am not too concerned about the situation in question. There are many good officers deep on the alternate list who want to live in Germany or Ft. Polk. The selection process is not perfect enough to have all the best at the top."

This TOE/TDA problem appeared to be extant in the combat service support area as well as combat arms and combat support.

"In my specialty (CSS) too many officers have been selected who are not qualified for the command. There have been officers as an example who have never been in a Division selected for DISCOM command. After discussing declinations and thoughts after selections with friends and selectees it became obvious that the perceptive was they were selected because a sponsor (friend, previous CO, etc) was on the board. Thus, many O6s

have concluded that the "Old Boy" network is almost a must for the selection boards only it is worse because too many are being selected strictly from OERs regardless of the experience that the OERs reflect i.e. officers making a career out of the Pentagon being selected before officers who have spent many years in the field."

"I accepted command because I feel having spent 8 years in a DISCOM, including BN command, DISCOM, XO, and Division G4 through the years. However, had I not been selected in the 1982 year, or had I been selected for other than DISCOM my inclination would have been to decline. Selection after 1982 would have pushed my age into 50 at the end of a minimum 2 year command tour, which effectively takes me out of the good job market with little potential remaining for further promotion in the Army."

And: "The most common reasons are, of course, family considerations wife working, children in school, desire not to move, timing etc. I feel that perhaps one that has not been addressed fully yet I consider of significant importance, particularly in the Combat Service Support -- Logistics areana, is that of the systems failure to match personal desires/capabilities with a type of command. There appears to be no way for an individual to be considered, for instance, as a DISCOM commander only based on personal desire or for depot only. Under the old Tech service selection procedure individual capabilities and desire played a stronger influencing factor. (I would have preferred a DISCOM)"

For the Corps of Engineers the problem appears different.

"I personally do not know anyone who declined O-5/O-6 command. However, among engineers, it appears that district assignments are considered superior to TOE or TDA troop commands. This appears to be largely attributable to the fact that district assignments directly improve potential for post-retirement employment. I've heard more than one engineer officer comment that he'd consider declining command of other than a district.

Another topic that reflected dissatisfaction among the command selectees was the absence of benefits for the commander and his family. The 28% of the sample that raised this issue did so typically as follows:

Commanders should be provided "perks." Good housing, dedicated, CDFs should not have to live in stairwells. Sedans should be provided. Front of the line service. High vis, high risk, high responsibility job. Little free time and long hours. Family should be provided every consideration to relieve strain of not having sponsor around, or working regular hours. Wife and children feel pressure of command -- you

and family are always on display. We need to spend more effort on family enhancement programs. Not willing to make the sacrifices that command demands without a reasonably high assurance that those sacrifices will pay off in promotion or some other highly desirable outcome. It's not worth the sacrifices without the payoff.

Upon arrival in FRG, as an O-6, Brigade level commander of a combat TOE outfit, I was given despicable, filthy quarters in a stairwell-top floor. My wife and I were heartsick, and still are. My initial reaction to that and the abominable status of the command was to say "the hell with it, and resign from command." But, I am a professional and felt I owed it to my soldiers and the Army to accept and persevere. The unit is much better now after one helluva lot of work and the soldiers and mission were better served by my remaining. However, we are still on the top floor of a filthy stairwell. I do not have any junior officers visit me or German nationals visit me in my quarters because I am too embarrassed over my quarters and do not want to convey the wrong message. What is even more humiliating is that all of my subordinates live in much better government quarters than I do."

"The pendulum has swung too far. Ten years ago the Army offered accelerated promotions, early command opportunities, Brigadiers were selected at 21-22 years. The stretch out due to command alone will drive people (bright, energetic people) out of the Army."

"The primary reasons for declinations are cited usually as tour length and environment. I, on the other hand, believe the actual reason to be status, prestige, reward, etc. He who commands risks all to do the best that he can. If successful, the recognition is fleeting at best. The non-commanders actually succeed at a better rate than the commanders -- why?"

And finally:

"Officers see their peers being promoted and getting good jobs who have not commanded. What is the reward for the high risk hard job -- an assignment to the Pentagon."

Retirement was frequently mentioned as a basis for declining command (16% of the respondents), but it generated little comment among those who accepted command. Those who expanded on the retirement issue tended to explain it as "time to start a second career."

The lengthened command tour was not popular among the Colonels responding to the survey. While no officer declined command for this reason, 22% cited this action specifically as a perceived cause for

declination, and one chose to elaborate.

"I think the rather presumptive move of extending command tenure to 30 months has, more than any other single act, significantly contributed to the increase in command declines. It has not added to stability because of the high turnover rates of soldiers and senior NCOs. In my branch, which does not have a great number of O5/O6 commands and where the physical and mental drain on these units is severe, the 30 month tour has further reduced opportunities and created mental blocks against endeavoring to endure a . . . command for that length of time. Lets get back to 18 month command tours!"

Although the survey did not attempt to assess the command selectees attitudes toward their peers who declined command, a substantial percentage, 13%, used the comment sheet as a vehicle to register their contempt for the declinees (or at least contempt for their reasons).

Not atypical was the following response:

"Officers decline command because it is (1) a tough job, (2) they are bureaucrats and know that they can't handle the added dimension of dealing with people (the quality of which is lower, despite our publicity to the contrary.), (3) are self serving and are not prepared to give 110% for the good of the organization rather than themselves, (4) do not have control of their own lives (wife wants a job, tied to a house or other type stories.), (5) they are not risk takers, (6) they know their limitations and don't accept command as a humanitarian act despite the fact that the system screwed up and selected them."

"I suspect there are some other reasons that don't come to me at this moment but look through all the rationalizations and you will come down to these type reasons for decline of command."

Similar thoughts were expressed as follows:

"I have no time for people who decline command. Why we allow such selfish people to remain in the Army -- is beyond my humble thought processes."

"They are basically the same people who will use the system for their own benefits exclusively -- the condition and time must be correct for them to command, life is not that way. Life is unfair, demanding, exact in its toll -- when you reach our rank one must answer the trumpet. -- If not get the hell out."

1. They lose sight of why they came in the Army - to serve.

2. They let self interest override duty and love for the soldier.

"Above officers should have a right to withdraw from selection process. Once they agree to stay and are selected -- no right to decline -- Serve wherever the Army needs them or retire!"

"All combat arms officers should fight to get command. If your goals change; get a new speciality or get out."

"I am an Infantry Officer -- it is not conceivable to me that an Infantry Officer can decline command and stay in the Army."

Some concluded the fault was not only that of the individual officer.

"They put these personal desires and considerations above the needs of the Army and their career and D.A. lets them get away with it!"

"Other than bona fide personal hardship cases, it's a cop out by self centered to soldiers who epitomize the true non-professional officer. Unfortunately, since the inception of the volunteer Army, our "system" breeds more of these types who are really not dedicated to the profession."

In sum, the thoughts of this group were most felicitously phrased by one of their numbers as follows:

"I feel very strongly that officers should not be permitted to choose, except in rare cases of exceptional extenuating circumstances. The honor of commanding American soldiers is so great and so important that unless an officer has previously asked not to be considered((and there are great contributions those officers can make) he/she should not hesitate to accept the assignment. After all, that's what officership is all about. Quite simply, and honestly, the thought of declining such as assignment never entered my mind. It's what I joined the Army to do. I never looked upon it as my choice to make."

"I submit that few, if any, of the questions concerning influences were considered by officers before accepting command, yet most such questions could be used to rationalize why an officer declined. You may find out why officers decline - you won't find out why officers accept. What we are witnessing, in my view, is a loss of the ideals of a profession of arms to the idea of a vocation, a job to be performed hopefully at minimum risk to orderly predictable promotions and security. The rewards of command are not material; they are a state of mind, a sense of service to country performed honorably and with resolve. They are not stepping stones to promotion or anything else."

The declinees own words provide a picture that is unlike the portrait of unprofessional conduct that is painted by others in several previous quotes. This section deviates from the table at the beginning of Chapter 5 because it includes information from a respondent who replied too late to be included in the numerical analysis. Thus, nine declinee comments rather than eight are discussed here. Of the nine declinees only three were combat arms officers. The most indignant of the three did so because he was sent to the schoolhouse (TDA) rather than to the sound of the guns (TO&E).

"I was a primary selectee and got TDA command, while activated alternates got TOE - tactical commands. Might be correct but its not right. This one factor, more than any other, caused me to decline command. The present system stinks!"

The second combat arms officer had a serious health problem.

"I have a seizure disorder that causes loss of memory for up to four hours. Not great for an Infantry commander. I am in the process of a medical eliminations board."

The declination of the third combat arms officer was accompanied by his commander's request for assignment deferral based upon the needs of his unit. In addition, the declinee's wife was in the second trimester of a "high risk" pregnancy. Based on both factors the declinee was given a deferral.

Two of the officers who declined command are members of the Adjutant General's Corps. The reasons they gave for their actions were:

"My basis for declining command was that the UCSA-DCSPER and TAG had all expressed their confidence in me to serve in an O7 billet as Dep TAG - all felt I could contribute more as DTAG. My situation was unique and perhaps I should not be surveyed -- I'll leave that to you."

"In regards to my specific declination, I declined command because the job I'm currently occupying is far more significant than an administrative command. I believe I can make a more significant contribution in my present job than in the command for which I was selected."

"I would have declined command prior to consideration by the board had I known I was eligible. (there was only one 06 command in my specialty and it was the first time it was centrally selected by a MILPERCEN board.)"

Personal considerations were not a factor in my declination.

A fair reading of these responses would not permit the inference of unprofessionalism that some of their peers have drawn.

The remaining four declinees provide a more complex picture. Two combat support officers provided lengthy statements of their reasons. Their unvarnished views follow.

"I wanted to command and was scheduled to assume command of the unit of my choice but was confronted with a personal situation in September 1981 which required I do one of two things. First, proceed to command as scheduled and serve the first year in an unaccompanied, geographical bachelor status or second, request a deferment until FY83. Since my wife and I believe that serving successfully in command requires a concerted, joint effort and commanding as a geographical bachelor should be avoided if at all possible, I decided to submit the request for deferment from FY82 to FY83 but also included a paragraph which stated":

"If deferment of command is not feasible, request consideration be given to granting an exception to policy that would permit deleting me from the FY82 Command List. Then upon review of my overall record, if I continue to demonstrate the potential to contribute as a commander, request that I be considered for revalidation by the FY84 Command Selection Board."

"I was telling MILPERCEN I wanted to command. The format and content of the request was extensively coordinated with MILPERCEN prior to submission and I was informed (1) the decision would definitely be made by the DCSPER, and (2) this decision would be made by 30 November 1981, in time to be incorporated in the FY83 Command List, if approved."

"Upon submitting the request for deferment, I immediately informed the MACOM that I was scheduled to join that I had submitted the request and forwarded complete copies of the request. I indicated that if the request was disapproved I would be serving my first year in command in a geographical bachelor status. I then received three calls from senior personnel in that command (to include the officer I was to replace) informing me that the Commanding General did not desire to have his commanders serve in that status."

"The deferment decision was not made by 30 November 1981 and I was unable to get any accurate information concerning its

status throughout December. Finally, on 8 January 1982, although all agencies and indorsements had recommended approval, the request was disapproved by the Director of Officer Personnel Management (not the DCSPER) and I was instructed to "proceed" or "decline." It appears the validity of my request was recognized since if I declined I was to be stabilized in my current assignment but I was also reminded that "I was selected for command and not my family." I have since been unofficially told that the disapproval was primarily based upon external pressures and not the validity of my request."

"Prior to receiving the actual disapproval, I had been very confident that the request would be approved. I then asked about the problem of my serving in a geographical bachelor status and I was told that "I should not let that policy deter me." Lastly, when I asked about that paragraph of my request which addressed consideration of deletion from the FY82 list and reconsideration for selection in FY84, I was told (1) deferment to FY83 was disapproved, (2) a written declination was required if I did not wish to assume command as scheduled in FY82, and (3) that an FY82 declination would then preclude my consideration for FY84 Command."

"What all this boils down to is I commanded for the five years immediately preceding my current assignment and I wanted to command as a colonel. My family required a stable environment for a short period of time and I had fully documented its necessity. MILPERCEN refused to address the complete situation and manipulated the declination."

"I have had the misfortune to effectively twice decline command. I, therefore, wish you luck in deciphering the seemingly mixed signals contained in my responses. I assure you, however, that the responses are valid."

"Likewise, the two declinations were valid but for entirely different reasons. The first, which resulted in a command deferral, can be categorized as being for personal/family reasons caused by gross personnel mismanagement. The second declination was based on career/professional motives and expectations developed during my year's tenure on the Army Staff during my deferral period."

"To begin, you should know that I think command, at any level, is the very essence of the Army; it is important; I love it; I am good at it. I actively sought command, despite the hardships it imposed upon my family throughout my career. Early during my time as a student at USAWC (Sep 79), I began expressing my command preferences to my assignment officer. In Mar 80, I was informed of my pending assignment to Washington, DC, an assignment which I objected to strongly. Shortly thereafter I was announced as an O-6 command alternate. At the advice of my assignment officer I entered into a real estate transaction which I could only escape from for military orders. Ten days prior to leaving Carlisle Barracks, I was

unofficially notified of a proposed assignment to command in Germany. I was thrilled. But my assignment officer would/could do nothing to keep me from moving to Washington, DC, for a new record 10-week assignment. My family was potentially needlessly disrupted and the inability to use the real estate military escape was a financial burden I could not afford. Two days after moving to Washington, DC, I was officially notified of my command activation. I declined explaining my circumstances to my new boss (though I had not yet reported for duty from leave) and the CG, MILPERCEN. The result was a one-year deferral. I was still interested in command but admit that the Army's personnel "system" didn't seem personal to me."

"The year's deferral led to the second declination which was based strictly on anticipated post-command job satisfaction. Rightly or wrongly, I concluded that the year's delay in assuming command, coupled with the new three-year command tour length, would commit me to a 30-year Army career if I accepted command. (At the end of command I would have 26 years service and be almost 49 years old--too old to begin a second career.) I then looked for job satisfaction potentials in expected post-command assignments for senior Colonels/junior Brigadier Generals in my specialties (25/53). Frankly, they turned me off. Number-two-flunkies, ARSTAF/JCS/DCA staff positions. No real Army jobs; they're all reserved to "killers." My perceptions of post command opportunities caused me to conclude, "thanks but no thanks." It wasn't worth the personal/family hassles; my ego got stroked enough by selection. I decided, therefore, to retire when eligible. I, therefore, declined command before slating but after revalidation. Believe me it was a tough decision. I was looking for some hope in any kind of post command job. I found none after long periods of consultation with peers and superior officers."

A combat service support officer who declined command did so primarily for family and retirement reasons, although he also had become dissatisfied with the officer personnel system.

"I was selected to command a DISCOM -- this was the command that I worked for since my initial assignment. I was assigned to 4 divisions, commanded 4 company's and the 1st S+T BN, Big Red One as well as G-4, III Corps and felt very qualified to command as DISCOM."

I decided to decline command and retire for several reasons -- (including, but not all inclusive) --

1. I was advised by several managers in business to retire prior to the age of 45 if I wanted a successful career with industry!
2. I had to wait 13 months from the time of the board and 9

months after announcement prior to assuming command. This delay, coupled with the length of the command tour would cause me to wait 4 years before I would have a shot at promotion to BG -- too long to "wait and see!"

3. The pay cap was too much of a limit on salary -- I have been with industry only 6 months and have been promoted once -- and draw is excess of \$45,000 plus the \$28,000 retirement pay, the hours and working conditions are much better!
4. I have purchased a large house -- with pool -- and have a financial plan that includes purchasing rental units -- which I could not do while on active duty.
5. My 15 year old was in a different school each school year (except one) since he started to school.
6. I first became disillusioned with the system during my tour in OPO, MILPERCEN.
7. I saw officers in my specialty -- 92 -- unfairly treated in both schools and promotions who were much better qualified than many of my friends in the combat arms.
8. I have become disillusioned with the promotion system when I saw BG _____ promoted to MG and other equally unqualified people being pushed ahead! The perfect example of the "Peter Principle".
9. I have been retired for 6 months and believe that I made the correct decision. It was difficult to turn down my DISCOM but after leaving the Army I find that there is so much more to life than the Army -- my priority is no longer the job -- it is now my family, my home, my community, my church and I can provide things that I never dreamed possible as a Col in the Army.

The remaining declinee who responded cannot be described further because he believed to do so would subject him to retaliation. He commented as follows:

"Moreover, people who decline are hesitant to provide narrative descriptions of their decisions in writing -- and there is no incentive to do so. In fact, there could be penalties attendant thereto.

- o An interview process would have been more informative provided guarantees of anonymity were provided by the Army.
- o The above of course does not assess whether the Army really

wants to know why people decline - because to know is to be confronted with a requirement to do something about it."

In addition, he cited the centralized selection system and family attitude as reasons for declination.

The depth of the officer's alienation is sufficiently great that his case provides the basis for an interesting argument for a continuation of the present declination process. It is indeed unlikely that a board would select such an officer to command if his attitude were known. If he achieves an identical result through declination, the Army is likely to be well served by the process.

CHAPTER VI

0-5 WRITTEN COMMENTS

One hundred and seventy-nine of the lieutenant colonels who responded included their written comments. Obviously, not all these comments could be included, but we attempted to give the full flavor of them in the pages that follow. The comments of the declinees were subjected to the least amount of editorial cutting. Thus, the length of the section relating to the declinees is longer than it would have been if it had been edited in the same manner as the acceptees comments. Twenty-six of the declinees who responded to the survey included written comments.

	<u>05</u>	<u>06</u>
1. Adverse effect on the family	45%	44
2. Inadequate return for effort expended and risks taken	39%	28
3. Undesireable Command Environment	29%	16
4. The process of slating for a command	25%	20
5. Adverse effect on children's education	23%	35
6. Excessive command tour length	18%	22
7. PCS	17%	19
8. Type Unit - TO&E v TDA	16%	14
9. Attraction of Retirement	15%	16
10. Insufficient Pay	13%	11
11. Inappropriate Timing	12%	11
12. Undesireable Oversea Location	11%	11
13. Wife's Employment	10%	27
14. CCSS Process	10%	18
15. Health	6%	6
16. Desireability of Current Assignment	5%	13
17. Undesireable Location (Other than Oversea)	4%	10
18. Undesireable Housing	3%	5
19. Cutbacks in Military Benefits	1%	1
20. Service Obligations	1%	not mention
Opposed to Declination	5%	13

The similarities between the responses of the lieutenant colonels and the colonels are far more striking than the differences. The concerns expressed were almost identical. Moreover, the percentages of officers concerned about a single issue were strikingly similar. These differences and similarities will be discussed throughout the subsections of this chapter.

As was the case with colonels (44%), family obligations were the largest single disincentive to accept command (45%). As one officer stated:

"I guess the point is that when there is no war, it is hard to ask people to overlook strong domestic considerations The "needs of the Service" wane in the cosmos when one has to live with the family every day."

Among those Lieutenant Colonels who accepted command and sought to comment on the problem a strikingly consistent theme was the degree to which the family supported the officer's decision.

"My wife's health is not good. Given a remote assignment that could have caused me to turn down command. Also, a consideration was the fact my oldest daughter is in high school. However, my beliefs are unchanged -- had I turned down the command for either of these reasons, I would have gotten out. Fortunately, my family supported me because they knew this is what I have always wanted to do -- and I'm having a ball!"

Reasons why I considered declining command.

"Children's education may suffer because of moving from an outstanding school system to a mediocre system."

"Wife's career again suffers from another move. She has been unable to achieve any continuity because of family moves. It takes a minimum of 3-6 months to get a new job after each move. Additionally, she will take a cut in salary in the new location."

"However, my wife never really considered the possibility I would turn down the command despite the hardships outlined above. Additionally, we both enjoy being with people and are looking forward to the social aspects of the command."

"At the time I was activated for command from the alternate list I was on orders to Korea with a home base assignment back to Ft. Sam Houston. I will admit that the fact that my family would be stabilized for 7 years did come into focus when making the decision to accept the command. However, every member of my family did want me to be a commander and this did influence my decision I can understand how this would affect a decision if pressure was applied by the family to not accept command."

"I'm glad someone turned down the job or else I wouldn't be here! -- I'm having a super time."

"I came within a cat's whisker of declining . . . only after 2+ weeks of reflection (and the forceful "advice" of my superiors) did I decide to take the plunge. Factors pro and con that I weighed are listed in order of importance."

- | | |
|-----|---|
| CON | <ul style="list-style-type: none">o 8 1/2% mortgage (\$400/month payments) in Woodbridge VAo Children happy and doing well in a good schoolo Only 9 months in saddle as an ARSTAF branch chief with challenging and rewarding future. |
| PRO | <ul style="list-style-type: none">o Strong push from Army brat (and career USAR officer) wifeo Sound advice of trusted friends and superiorso Need for a change (after 6 years in Washington)o The excitement of the challenge |

"Bottom Line: As a one time non select to O5, I had not even dreamed of a command opportunity . . . thus, when it was offered, I was totally unprepared to make a decision. It took me several weeks and lots of help to get my head screwed on straight. I don't regret accepting."

Although there were exceptions, another theme that emerged was the shared nature of the decision to accept command. Without belaboring the obvious, the Lieutenant Colonels seemed to view their families more as the decisionmakers rather than as an adjunct to the officer who made decisions that the family followed.

"Whether we want to believe it or not, strong family support is required for any job, especially for command. Reasonable sacrifices associated with accepting command would be accepted by my family. They realize and support a more frequent availability of Dad, family activities being dictated by job demands, and increased social responsibilities and obligations. They would not support these sacrifices without a perception that a command was an enhancement of my personal and professional goals, or that the family unit relationship would suffer severe and permanent impairment. Consider that the family has made continuing sacrifices in their living

conditions, family relationships, and additional costs to support the military career. After 18+ years of these sacrifices, the family wonders if the sacrifices have been worth it, and if the quality of life in the civilian community would be any worse. If the family was not supportive of a command assignment, I would have declined command because I could not, in good conscience, have done as good a job at command as I could have with the total support of the family. To have done this without the family support would have resulted in a losing situation for the Army, my family, and myself."

"My decision not to decline command was based on the positive assessments of all of the above. I enter into command knowing that I am fully qualified, enthusiastic, and will provide a positive contribution. My family, while recognizing that there are some pitfalls, are supportive and willing to contribute in their own way. Without these positive indicators, I would have felt that all would have been better served by my declination. If the above was true for my acceptance, the converse would have been true for declination."

"Many officers have bought homes, wives working, and children in school; with all the pressures of raising a family these days, I can readily see why an officer might not consider commanding."

"As for me, my wife hasn't taught school since the children were born, our home is back in our H.O.R. and rented out 'til we return, and my children are under the strong supervision of a good mother. In other words, our family has always pointed towards command in the Army with all the family stresses and was prepared for them."

"I accepted command, however, those officers whom I know that declined command, did it for primarily family reasons. My family does support this move but it is with regrets that they have to change schools and leave a good job. This is probably the last time that I can ask them to make this choice."

The importance of good schools for children and not moving the children during their final high school years was important but not as important for this group (23%) as it was for the colonels (35%).

"Children in high school - need good high school experience to do well in college and later life. Selection for me came at an opportune time because my oldest daughter is now a sophomore. The move to the command assignment will give her the junior and senior year in high school at one place."

"I did not decline command, however, the most often heard phrase is that somewhere the sacrifices to family have to stop. Usually at the O5-O6 command level. The officer is at the age of having high school children. At that age, high

school kids often need stabilization which military family often do not have, especially those officers in the running for command."

The impact of overseas service on the family also weighed heavily on the lieutenant colonels.

Overseas housing and schools are embarrassing.

Child has learning disability and needs specialized education. Overseas schools will not provide it.

"Owning a home did not influence my decision to CMD or not. Leaving it quickly (unsold) and paying high mortgage payments plus government Qts in Europe is a killer. But there was no decision of if it should stop me from commanding."

"If the command I am ultimately offered at the end of my deferment is overseas, long tour, I will be faced with another major decision -- to either decline or go overseas without my family. So that this is in proper perspective, I have a good strong marriage with a wife who has fully supported the Army and me up until the last 2 or 3 years. Due to the economy, she started her own career which would be terminated by overseas assignment. In this regard, I do not feel my situation is unlike many other officers. Command (and 05/06) management needs a fresh relook because officer management assumptions from the past no longer apply. Although I've accepted command (05 level) I feel I've "sold-out" my family. I'm a soldier -- my family understands that. But, I've returned from a "short" tour (Korea) only 20 months ago and my command will be -- you guessed it -- Korea, again "short" tour."

Finally, although the issue of the wife's employment surfaced for 10% of this group respondents, it was not as significant an issue as it was for the colonels (27%).

More often than was the case with colonels, 39% vs 28%, there is a perception in this group of respondents that the rewards for accepting command are not commensurate with the risks that are taken.

"Why endure the high risk, long hours, and hassles if you have exactly the same visibility and opportunity for promotion?"

"Is the risk/reward worth the heartache? Under the current promotion system an officer has a good opportunity to make 06 without ever having a command; therefore, why should he take the risk and long hours associated with accepting a command. At the 0-6 level things change somewhat in that those officers who have aspiration of making 0-7 will certainly not turn down

a command. Those who are 0-6's and satisfied to retire as an 0-6 will generally turn down a command. I personally enjoy command and my family has suffered because of it. A lot of people do not like the pressure of command and, in the past, have taken command only because they perceived that it was necessary for promotion to the next grade. This perception no longer exists; therefore, why punish yourself and your family when you can get the same promotion (at least to 0-6) with little risk, shorter working hours, and plenty of time with your family."

"In both cases (of officers I know) the individuals felt that with specialty promotion floors that their chances for promotion to 0-6 would not be adversely affected by declining command. This attitude of not putting up with the high risks involved with command because a "good file" will get you promoted just as easily, seems more and more prevalent among officers eligible for command. Chief of Staff's comment at P.C.C. that command will not insure promotion even if performance is outstanding due to speciality promotion floors, reinforces this perception."

"Too demanding, too much, pressure, long hours away from families, limited recognition for high performance, and it is risky. These negative aspects outweigh perceived rewards (e.g. improved probability of making 0-6 or enhanced personal satisfaction from commanding). In short, some 0-5's don't want the problems and headaches that come from command. They would rather enjoy their family and present life style and take their chances at making Colonel (50%), based on less demanding non-command assignments."

"In my opinion, many officers decline command because they see it as a "risky" assignment -- a chance to lose all and gain little. The Army today holds its commanders responsible for perfection and thoroughly points out the unit's imperfections to him. Successful command will keep you in the Army and up with other capable specialists. Unsuccessful command will get you an early retirement and assure your non-promotion."

"On the other hand, to succeed as a non-command staff officer, one need only continue in his specialty field as he has been for the last 10 years, or so. So long as he maintains his integrity, that officer will likely be promoted right along with the successful commanders. Little risk!"

"Given that choice, many will choose not to relocate and take on the additional headaches of command even for the rewarding feelings of helping people that a commander enjoys. By the way, there is little prestige or privilege given to commanders so that is not an incentive to accept."

Finally, it is significant that these commanders are not concerned solely with their own cost/benefit equation. This concern extends to

their families.

"My wife had a very supportive and positive attitude toward command until we arrived at our CONUS post. Quarters were not available and we had been led to believe command designated quarters would be available within 10 days of our arrival. Commanders are required to live on post. I will wait at least 60 days for quarters (I will be in command over 30 days when I get a house). This in itself is not an unreasonable wait, however, we PCS'd from Korea and have been living out of suitcases since 24 January 82 (approximately 4 months)."

"The end result is a wife who is not happy with her new post, is convinced the Army does not care about wives or families, feels I should get out at 20, and the demands and requirements of command are not worth the effort in light of the PCS upsets and lack of concern on the part of the Army for the family."

"I might add, if the housing situation had been accurately stated I would have settled my wife near relatives for three or four months and had her come here after quarters were available. This would have reduced the upsets, and her overall attitude toward the Army and our new post would be much better."

"The job is super but we must do better with the families if we expect to receive the support we need to get the job done."

The issue of command environment was also a dissatisfier for many of the respondents (29%), as opposed to 16% of the colonels. Some saw this issue directly related to the lengthened command tour.

"Officers decline command because they fear the styles and strain of command created primarily by senior commanders. Current senior commanders (Bde and Div) commanded battalions for only 6-12 months. It was a "hardship" tour for them with complete neglect of personal goals and family. Now they expect their battalion commanders to do the same -- for 3 years!!!"

"I concur with the longer command tours; however, senior commanders must "back off" and realize that we are in for the long course. We must be able to take leave and spend some time with our families."

Assistant Division Commanders were repeatedly singled out, for reasons that were not explained, as sources of an unsatisfactory environment.

- o Long hours in a constant pressure cooker. Most ADC's rave and rant about everything -- no matter how many "pluses" one has, you can't keep all the balls in the air at once.

But not all the environmental problems were attributed to the attitudes of senior commanders.

"There is a perception that the quality of the soldier is very low and that all of the motivation effort in the world cannot overcome the initial inertia and poor attitude."

"Increased personnel turbulence coupled with lack of recognition of BTMS above brigade level are the two major factors which take away the enjoyment of command. Expansion of key personnel tour lock-in and better planning at MACOM and higher headquarters could help eliminate these perceived obstacles."

It is noteworthy that there was not a single reference to lack of funds or opportunities for training, maintenance or operations in the comments of the Lieutenant Colonels.

The length of command tour is unpopular among the group (18%), but not as unpopular as it is with the colonels (22%).

"The 'freight train' has not slowed down. The 30-month commander is required to sustain the same pace as did the 18-month commander. Only the duration that the pace must be maintained has been changed. How can an ALO2 Army with an ALO1 mission facing some of the most major equipment and MTOE changes in its history slow down? My premise is that the declination problem is directly related to PRESSURE. People have trouble admitting they don't want to undertake the pressure of Bde/Bn command for the length of time now required. It is far easier to offer a myriad of other 'save face' reasons for command declination. What was the declination rate prior to the 30 month tour length? Many field grade officers I have dealt with have the perception that there are an extensive number of battalion commanders relieved after a year or more of command. This perception and the length of tour, in my opinion, are contributing significantly to the declination problem. The problem is perceived as particularly difficult in Europe."

"In USAREUR the 'pace' is ridiculously severe! A 30 month tour (+ or -6) is too long for 95% of what have proven themselves to be outstanding officers. USAREUR command should be 18-24 months -- burn out will still get many even with a 24 month tour and my peers have all seen it and at our age simply decide that their lives are much too short no matter how

precious command is."

And a large percentage of those who raised this issue were concerned about the fact that they were the only member of the battalion whose tour was stabilized.

"I think my only concern about the extended command period is that it fixes only part of the problem. The turbulence in staffs, company commanders and particularly NCO's will continue. BN Commanders with 4, 5, or 6 adjutants, 3 or 4 XO's and S-3's during the tour are now becoming victims of turbulence instead of being part of the problem. This is key in the Bde and Div staff positions. They rotate through with ideas on how things can be done and seem to all have the attitude that yes the next twelve months are really busy, perhaps over committed, but once we get through that we'll be set up. They keep the train running faster than is healthy for the lower levels."

But at least one officer concluded that the problems of the 30 month tour were transitory.

"Another conception taken by some "decliners" (I've heard this) is that the pace of command is such that it is not fun and a guaranteed burn out. I believe these people are relating to their own experience where they suffered under the 12 month hero who was determined to revolutionize the world and grab his vis and press on to DA greatness. This perception will only pass with the time when present Captains become LTC's and reflect on the magnificance of the 30 month commander."

Only 10% of the group perceived problems with CCSS, as opposed to 18% of the colonels, but the lieutenant colonels raised some fundamental questions about CCSS.

"I accepted command because it represented the fulfillment of my personal aspirations, period. I feel that I would have declined command without this strong personal motivation. I would have declined command because I see the system through which I must advance as dehumanizing, impersonal, and demeaning. It is my perception that the "Old Boy Net" is alive and well, but now works through the CCSS."

"The system perpetuates highly successful officers performing non-demanding military functions. Many positions demand expertise of primary and secondary skills and failure in that arena means failure across the board. Those highly successful officers -- below the zone promotions are offered assignments to pick from. From personal experience through discussion with below the zone officers and centrally command selected, I

have found they personally avoided difficult assignments and selected assignments with high visibility, low risk. From these political positions they are selected to command, leaving the gaining unit with a highly mobile, politically astute, ignorant commander. His ability to influence the mission is totally dependent upon assigned personnel. Not bad if all 'doers' and not 'users'."

"I feel that most officers consider command declination because of distrust of the command/officer management system. We change the rules too often. The most common reasons given -- family consideration, home purchase, too many PCS, etc are symptoms not cause. If I believed that the officer management system was both stable and creditable then I would have no concern about risk or sacrifice for the opportunity to enjoy command. I don't trust the decision and direction coming from DCSPER or MILPERCEN. I have concern for the Officer Corps. I will accept command because I've wanted it too long and I'll be good at it. But I have reservations."

And for those who are concerned about whether the Army is becoming an occupation rather than an institution, one officer posed a particularly poignant critique.

"When command tours were short and de-centralized, there was a general feeling that the "system" was fair and hard work/ambition would receive its just reward. A person who put out the effort could manage to manipulate his way into command and future field marshal-dom. In essence, those that wanted it could get it, those that didn't could take the consequences and press on. Now, though, the situation is different."

"I believe that many officers in the Corps feel that the situation is now inherently unfair. Personal manipulation is largely impossible under centralized OPMS. Quirks in records, e.g., bad OER's cannot be overcome because the division CG knows you-the board doesn't know you and can't select you because of the narrow selection window. The extended command tours cause the Army to select only a small portion of all those officers "qualified/deserving", thereby causing many "qualified" non-selectees to feel that they got shafted. What this means in sum, is that faith in "the system" is undermined and some Officers begin to look for "what's best for me" solutions, e.g., declination or early out or economically transferable PCS'. Hard work, good looks and a winning personality will not necessarily get you on the team. Selection is a matter of perfect OER's, great assignments and good luck. (I've heard numerous comments about old guy boards, young guy boards, muddy boots boards etc.) In all, this combination of perceptions causes many people to start worrying about themselves personally earlier than they might otherwise. Faith in the institution is slipping. (Emphasis added.)"

But the majority supported CCSS in a manner similar to that reflected below.

"Without a doubt the CCSS is better than the 'Old Boy Net' overall. Board members will tell you that there is still some of the 'Old Boy' in the CCSS and it is evident when you see the selection list and the board members. Maybe this is true for relatively small branches. It's human nature to select an officer who has worked for you or with whom you might have developed a personal friendship. The CCSS is still the better system but it would certainly be interesting to know why some officers are not selected and some are not selected in their first and second year eligibility. Often it is directly related to selection board members."

There was also substantial support for the proposal of LTC Estep, Army, April 1982, which would modify the CCSS with "wild card" selections from the field. Finally, officers saw some positive value in the aspect of CCSS that permitted declination.

"The system must have a safety valve to release those that are not motivated/do not want the job. I would not want to serve with a man who felt compelled to be there."

"Its time we oriented on the professional and not the "occupational" careerist. Not all are cut-out to command -- we have plenty of important jobs for those folks to do -- without aura of perceived/real prejudice. I thought this was what OPMS -- dual tracking was supposed to do for the Army."

"My impression from 3 years in MILPERCEN is that officers decline command for the whole spectrum of possible reasons, although family considerations and "what's really important to me" do play a great role. There must be no sanction against officers declining command. Some do so for good family or career reasons, and make way for equally good and more eager potential commanders. The last thing that we need is a corps of reluctant commanders."

-- The peacetime "ticket punch" syndrome has always bothered me badly. I think that it's healthy that senior officers are honest enough to decline command if they don't want it, whatever the reason. We will have a better Army because of them.

"While we might not admire those so motivated, I believe we have to recognize that our "cutting process" might encourage them. And what the heck, is it not so much better LTC A drops his hands during the flag passing ceremony, then hang on for 30 months dragging 700 people down? That might be a more

reliable indicator of honesty."

While the CCSS system got generally good reviews from the 05 respondents, the slating process did not. With only one exception, the officers who commented on slating expressed dismay. In some cases the concern was of such magnitude that the command selectees questioned the integrity of those responsible for the process. For clarity, this portion of the discussion is divided into three sections: the TO&E/TDA issue, the square peg/round hole issue, and personal/impersonal treatment issue. The latter issue is discussed first.

The principal complaint in the realm of "personal treatment" was that no one ever asked the selectees about their preferences prior to slating.

"The system does not address the issue of the selectee's desires as to what type of unit or the location they would prefer. The only choices open are 'Yes, I'll accept the one you offer me' or 'No, I decline.' A letter to the selectee after the selection asking for a current priority list of units, by type, that he would prefer to command would be an added factor for the slating board to use in the decision process. In my case, I had no input options at any point in the proceedings and received a short welcoming letter from my future Commanding General some 2 1/2 months after being told I was selected for command. Rather a poor way to put the 'personal' in personnel management."

Others sought, unsuccessfully, to get the assignment process to meet what they considered were legitimate personal needs.

"I have been overseas for 4 1/2 years. While I personally like the area my designated command will place me and my family out of the US for 7 1/2 years (assuming full command tour length) the personnel types were not sensitive at all to this unusual requirement. When I asked if I could be slipped to a CONUS command opening? Their reply was I could exercise my option to decline -- professionalism at its highest."

"The geographical location of my command was the one and only item that caused me to consider the possibility of declining command. Upon completion of the command tour, I will have spent 8 years in the State of Kentucky without break. My attempts to change the command assignment were futile. I volunteered for Germany since I speak, read and write German

fluently and therefore felt I could be of more value to the Army, however, this made no difference. I was the XO of the battalion I will command as of August 1982, from June 1978 to May 1980."

"Command selectees should be consulted prior to finalizing the command slate. Personal desires should receive more considerations in the slating of commanders."

"To my estimate the slating process is the worst method in the process. It involved in my case 2 moves and a considerable delay in getting to my command. This could have been avoided. As a result I am leaving my family stateside and taking an all others tour in Europe. This was the result of an assignment officers predilection to satisfy two personnel requirements with one body -- me. This will cost me three years of family separation. Obviously this has an impact on my outlook toward continued service."

But at least one officer found help at MILPERCEN.

"It would be worthwhile for me to recap for you the sequence of events associated with my selection and slating for command."

1. I, along with everyone else eligible for command received my letter so stating eligibility and asking for input on assignment considerations if applicable. I dutifully indicated that my son was a sophomore in high school and that my wife was 6 months into a 2 year medical technician course which, while having no impact on whether or not I accepted command if selected, would impact on the family. I further stated that based on my situation at that time (and now) I would appreciate (a) being allowed to command at Ft. Jackson if selected (where I was and am) or (b) be slated late in the FY if for a TOE battalion in order to resolve the family separation to which my wife and I had agreed would be necessary.
2. I was indeed slated for battalion command here at Ft. Jackson and (a) wife graduates in 3 months and (b) #1 son (only child) is soon to be a senior.

"In summary, my story to date has a happy ending. My family considerations drove my request -- at the same time I want to make it clear that if "the system" had not been able to accommodate my request I would have accepted command no matter where or when it was!"

"As an 18 year old private I thought it would be great to be a sergeant so I could lead, as a 19 year old acting jack I thought it would be great to be a Lt. so I could lead and as a 20 year old Lt. I thought it would be great to be a Captain so I could command! I still feel that way today and see no reason why any officer should/could feel any other way unless there are significant family or health reasons. . ."

"One other point. My combat arms 'buddies' find it incredible that I would even 'hint' that TDA command was acceptable with even the remotest possibility of getting TOE command. My response is consistent. While it has been a dream to command a tank battalion or CAV squadron, there are very real family considerations which must be dealt with as well. As an Army "brat" I was moved my senior year and high school graduation meant nothing. I didn't want my son to go through that."

"In closing (and I recognize this smacks of careerism) I may have 'hurt' my chances of continued advancement by not keeping my mouth shut and perhaps getting TOE command. Statistics bear this out. However, I did what I thought was right for my family and myself and have no regrets. The challenges and rewards of TDA command are just as necessary and important to the total Army mission and I love it!"

And one found help higher up the chain.

"I was initially selected and slated for command at a unit and location which was my first choice to command at and which I had PCS'd from into my present job. Also my present job has me located about 70 miles from that command. However, the MACOM (good Old Boy Net) changed the assigned prepared slate by MILPERCEN. MACOM could not give MILPERCEN a cogent reason for this. But through my own first hand knowledge, the slate was changed because of old friendships which existed between the commander and another command selectee who had been slated to go to _____. The MACOM commander was adamant, he would not change his decision which was to change the original slating. After 10 months of dangling, I contacted General Meyer and informed him of what and how the command selection and assignment process was working and that objectivity was being sacrificed at the expense of 'Old Boy' influences. I also told General Meyer that I would decline command. The whole slating was then reversed again and I accepted command."

"I only accepted command after 10 months of rangling because I felt I owed a sense of duty to the Army since they (the Chief of Staff) has seen merit in my argument and had forced the MACOM to change."

Matching the commander's skills to a particular unit was a task that the selectees knew was difficult. Recognizing this difficulty, they still perceived some shortcomings.

"MILPERCEN was honest enough to tell me that although I'm commanding in Specialty 15, I'll never see another SC 15 assignment. Command became a "ticket punch" in my case. After two (plus) years in command, I'll never see the specialty again. How would you feel?"

"Though I accepted command, the decision to do so weighed heavily for some time. The primary factors which cast doubt on whether I should accept command were as follows:"

- My perception of the inadequacy of previous assignments to prepare me for the myriad of tasks which lie ahead.
- A dissatisfaction with the nuclear surety aspects of FA command. Too often I have seen lives ruined by the excessive demands wrought by nuclear programs. The extent to which inspection teams truly assist/advise is often a joke, despite the accolades heaped upon inspectors at out briefings. I have long felt that one "strike" by subordinates means you're "out".
- The feeling that my real expertise, and my first love, lies in my secondary specialty, Aviation.

"My only complaint, or perhaps comment would be the better word, is the type of command I was selected for. I am a primary 37 secondary 35. The position of commander (Counterintelligence and Signal Security Support BN) calls for a 36/37. My intelligence experience has been signal intelligence collection or strategic production on the 35 side. I have no previous experience in the HUMINT or Counterintelligence disciplines. My only experience with signal security has been very peripheral. I have had to do some learning which is ok but the Army really is not getting their money's worth from the training and experience I have in the signal intelligence business. However, maybe someone knew what they were doing."

And when the officer perceived an opportunity to correct a skill match-up problem and was rebuffed by the Army as an institution substantial dissatisfaction occurred.

"Even though my general attitude would dictate that I accept any command under any circumstances, I actually considered declining this particular command based on the circumstances."

"I have been assigned as an operations officer, an evaluator, and a tactician for eight years in the NATO air defense community. Although I worked primarily with the HAWK missile system, I have also gained considerable experience in the command and control area and with the Nike-Hercules system. Instead of being slated for a HAWK Battalion in Germany, I am slated for a forward Area Weapons Training battalion at Ft. Bliss."

"What I consider a poor match up based on experience and location was only partly responsible for my disillusionment. When

I called DA to ask for consideration for changing my pending command for a command in 32d AADCOM, with two names of 05's who were slated for command in 32d AADCOM who could have been willing to switch, representative at DA would not even discuss it with me. The only reason given was that it's too much paperwork involved. If two or three additional letters or DF is 'too much' we're in serious trouble."

The pretige of a TO&E command and relative lack thereof for a TDA command was as much an issue for this group (16%) as it was for colonels. (14%).

"I, like many of my contemporaries, would not have had any enthusiasm for other than a TO&E unit command. Had I been faced with choosing whether to accept an other than TO&E command, I'm not sure what my reaction would have been; but probably, it would have been to accept with the full intention to retire at 20 years."

-- Of the few officers I personally know who have declined there are a variety of reasons. However the bottom line has been the type battalion designated (NDN-TOE).

However, this problem has additional dimensions for lieutenant colonels.

"TDA commands do not carry the same weight as TOE commands -- Chances of command at 06 level, if you command at 05 level in TNG BN, are zero -- I might have reconsidered by choice had I known that fact."

"Under current OPMS procedures, the following preceptions concerning Infantry branch may be causing command selectees to decline command":

1. If you command a TDA Bn your chances of being selected for SSC are slim.
2. Chances of being promoted to 06, if you have the right secondary specialty (e.g., 41), are just as good whether you command or not so why put up with the hardships of command.

Although retirement was frequently cited as a reason for declination, 15%, few of the respondents added an explanation. Among those who added an explanation there was little agreement.

"They have decided to retire and therefore do not need a command to fulfill their Army career aspiration."

"I believe most officers decline command because they have decided to retire in the foreseeable future and don't care to subject their families to the 'stress' of such a tour."

"Command conflicts directly with efforts to establish a foundation for retirement. Especially true for O-6's, but also for O-5's nearing 20 years. I will reach 20 years while in command in Europe -- a very difficult position from which to seek employment in a second career, purchase a home, etc. I know of one engineer officer who specifically chose a more saleable engineer staff position rather than be considered for command (and he was very competitive)."

The attitude of this group toward its peers who declined command was far more restrained than the colonels, who opposed declination. Moreover, only 5% of this group expressed disapproval of declinees while 13% of the colonels commented adversely on those who declined. This is not to say that this group approved of declination, but their disapproval lacked the fire of their seniors.

"I personally believe most officers who decline command have reached the mid-life crises point -- they begin to examine alternatives to the military life style. This can occur in the type society we have. As the economy worsens and the energy supplies dwindle, we are all going to have to get more serious about life. All of the alternatives will no longer present themselves. I believe that the future is going to see a return to a more disciplined Army and officers are going to work harder at being professional. Right now we have an officer corps with numerous opportunists and 'ticket punchers.' Weed them out."

This group tended to focus more on the shortcomings of the Army in failing to create selfless officers rather than the absence of selflessness in the officer.

"A Career as an Army officer cannot be all things to all people. Either you are totally committed to the career or you aren't. I do not mean this in a negative sense. However, if we allow officers to 'pick and choose' in the important area of command we are doing a disservice to the officer and the Army. Leadership and command are integral parts of our commission. We seem to have developed a general attitude of 'command is distasteful to me and my family' -- long hours, hard work etc -- so why should I put up with it? Although 'noncommanding' officers definitely make a contribution to the Army, I say BS to the I. Therefore, I see the principal

reason for declination as a shift to what is good for the individual not the organization. Fewer and fewer officers want to command because they can get promoted without it. We officers are not managers alone, we are primarily leaders -- including commanders."

"Change the focus of what we're about -- quit sending so many to grad school (I sent them as an assignment officer) keep them out of staff jobs and in the field. Talk up the real meaning of a commission -- selfless service and leadership, and quit talking to officers as if they were all managers for IBM. Reestablish our organizational commitment to mission accomplishment through soldiers. If that notion could be reborn, and permeate the Army - declinations would drop significantly."

Finally, it was a perception of some of this group that the reason for the rising number of declines was that OPMS was working properly.

"Your cover letter states that 'the number of declinations continued to be of concern . . .' This implies that any officer worth his/her salt should want to command and would not decline command if considered and selected. This implication runs contrary to the specialty accession under OPMS. Let the CCSS shake itself out. Give OPMS a chance to succeed or fail on its own merits. The officer corps is watching school/promotion board results. Declination of command will not become a real problem until the Army has more commands than it has qualified or willing officers."

Among the declines, family consideration were the principal causes of the declinations. Among those family concerns, most declinations were triggered by a pending overseas assignment.

1. I have the same basic problems as all O5's.
 - a. Boy entering college.
 - b. Boy entering high school.
 - c. Aging/ill parents.
 - d. A wife that dislikes Germany.
 - e. The highest cost of living time of my life:
2. I declined command for two reasons:
 - a. My command assignment was to Germany and my wife, and therefore my two sons, would not have accompanied me.
 - (1) Braces
 - (2) 3 cars / insurance for teen ager
 - (3) College
 - (4) Greater entertainment requirements (club bill!)
 - (5) Two boys that eat for six.

- b. I secured a position with Bell Helicopter doing about the same thing I am doing now - but it pays \$9,000 a year more to start, in Ft. Worth yet.

"The primary reason I declined command was that I was slotted for command of a unit that would have required my 3 high school age children, one of which was a senior, to travel 100 miles per day to attend school. The assignment system has very limited flexibility. When I was notified of where my command would be, I asked my assignment officer if my assignment could be changed to a location nearer to a high school. The answer was no. If the system had considered the impact on my family I would have accepted command."

"I made the choice to decline command because I was not in a position to accept another overseas assignment if it could be prevented. I expect my mother to die within the next year, and as such asked for a year deferment in assuming command. I was not willing to continue asking doctors for statements to provide to some unknown analysis in the Surgeon General's Office. Also my family has reached the age where a relocation outside CONUS has a much greater effect on their lives than did the previous 20 moves in 23 years. One daughter started college this year and another starts next year. I would now and would have accepted then command at a stateside post."

"Although many factors entered into my decision to decline command I think there were two, perhaps three primary factors, perceptions if you will that caused me to decline command. First, I believe my slating was arbitrary. Second, having returned from an overseas assignment nine months before being notified of my selection for command I did not believe that I was vulnerable for an unaccompanied overseas tour. However, the command I was slated to assume called for an unaccompanied assignment in Korea. Also, it may well be that the family side of the decision equation was the overriding factor. It's hard to say. I have a son nineteen and a daughter seventeen. My son is a second year college student and my daughter is a high school senior. The crux of this is that the unaccompanied tour for me would in essence be a similar experience for my wife. Thus, an unaccompanied tour for me at this time would in my view signal to my family a clear cut decision for the Army versus the Family. Had I been faced with such a decision four or five years earlier in my career I believe I would have accepted the unaccompanied tour without the feeling that a decision would pit the Army against the Family."

"These comments are offered in the context that I was extremely pleased and honored to be selected to command and although it ultimately became necessary for me to decline command, there is no bitterness on my part and I view my Army career with pride and a sense of accomplishment. It has been a super experience for me."

1. With a Masters and Bachelors in Petroleum Engineering, the civil industry will provide a financial security which the service does not recognize.
2. My wife was diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis and is expected to be an invalid within the next year.
3. My younger son is dyslexic and special schooling was not available in Okinawa.
4. As an alternate on the 1979 Command List, I was given five days notice to assume command two weeks later in Okinawa after just returning from Belgium and closing on a home. I expected the loss to be large with no compensation by the Government. A civilian company would have not made their employee absorb such a loss. A request to decline and be considered for the next list was accepted. Between selection on the first consideration for the next list and designation of the command, family considerations listed in items two and three above, plus the opportunity to enhance my financial security lead me to the decision to decline command and retire.

"I was activated from the alternate command list (FY 82) after having been on the FY 80 alternate list. By the summer of 1981, I felt it doubtful that I would be activated, and my family and I decided we would like another turn in Europe before we yielded to strong family/business pressure to retire. We got the European tour we wanted (Belgium), and PCS'd in mid-81. We had just gotten settled when I was motivated of the activation for command of an MI Battalion in Germany. I visited the unit, which was scheduled to move in mid-82 to another location in Germany, and subsequently declined command for the following reasons":

- a. Had I accepted command, my son (age 15) would have attended a different school for each year of his four years of high school.
- b. None of my family wanted to move again, much less twice more.
- c. A family business opportunity has existed for me for several years, and I have planned for some time to retire in '83 or '84 and enter this business. Had I accepted command for a two year period, I would no doubt have been selected for 06, which would have meant a lock-in period; then perhaps SSC and another lock-in, which would total perhaps six years -- and I simply did not want to spend that much additional time on active duty.
- d. I cannot contemplate any MI 06 job which I feel would be worth sacrificing an '83 or '84 entry into the business opportunity described above.

But family concerns were not limited to those officers who were slated to serve in overseas commands.

There are three principle reasons for my declining command that were not discussed in your questionnaire.

1. A recent divorce.
2. The desire to spend quality time with my children.
3. The belief that I can contribute equally in other positions.

"My reason for declining was for family reasons. My three children are in or approaching high school age and deserve more of my time than I've been able to provide in the past. They also deserve a stable environment in which to grow through their critical years. Our family has moved 14 times in 15 years. That's ridiculous! They will not move again after Germany. We are moving into our home where we expect to retire and stay there. There was no flexibility in my command slating, Fort Riley or nowhere. I chose nowhere. Had there been another option permitting command at a location nearer home, where my family could better cope with my long hours and extended absences, things could have been different. The thought of 30 months in isolation in Kansas were too much. 18 months, maybe, 30 months, never. I have no regrets over my decision at this point and have resigned myself to the fact that I'm now serving at my terminal grade. I've an excellent record with 2 below the zone field grade promotions but command is the magic ticket to O6 in my specialty (25)."

"Successful officers can expect senior service schooling and subsequent reassignment to Washington. Command will have placed a burden on the family; assignment to Washington will continue the duration of that burden as well as be economically detrimental."

"Personally, I could live with the above in hopes that I might make some change in my battalion. However, I could not ask my family to share that burden."

"There is one task of current command that is unacceptable to me; that of counseling enlisted members on how to obtain welfare assistance or second jobs. It is, in my opinion, a national disgrace, and personally abhorrent. It should be a basic principal that the Army will not put its enlisted personnel in a position which will require acceptance of food stamps or a second job to support his or her family."

"In short, it was impossible for me to rationalize the economic and family impact of continued (hopefully successful) service to the Army. The decision to leave the Army after 19 years of

service was the most difficult I have ever made. However, as I view the continuing trend to reduce retirement and benefits (medical, etc.), I am no longer convinced that the Army will take care of my family if I am not there. The foregoing combined with the negative economic impact of continued service, formed the basis for my decision."

"I was pleasantly surprised to receive your study in the mail. This represents the only interest that the Army, as an institution, has shown in the reasons why I turned down Command. (Editor's Note - This was a frequent comment in the FY '79 study; it appeared only twice this year.)"

"When I came out on the Lieutenant Colonel's Selection List, my written response to the branch questionnaire on whether I was interested in consideration for Command was very positive. I was sure I wanted to command a battalion. That was what I looked forward to and trained for during all my past assignments. However, I had never given the matter any serious thought. I had always accepted the fact that I would command. Finally the time had come when I was being asked if this was really what I wanted to do."

"With this question in mind, my wife and I spent the next seven or eight months in very serious discussions about whether this was really something we wanted to do, if it was consistent with our goals in life and what priority this opportunity would take as far as our family was concerned. My final conclusion was that to me the important things in life no longer centered around Command, promotions, awards, or any of the other traditional measures of success in the Army. I found that my priorities centered around my family, which up until that point in my career, had really taken a back seat to my duties and my "career." Success to me was no longer defined as achieving a particular rank or being assigned to a particularly prestigious job. As a result of this self examination and decisionmaking process, I submitted a preference statement which stated that I no longer desired or would accept a Command position. The submission of this statement took place approximately one month prior to the publication of the Command List, before I knew I was on the list. When the list was published and my name did appear on it as a primary selectee, my Branch Chief called and asked if my feelings were still the same. At that time I told him that my decision had been made from the standpoint of what would I do if I actually were on the list. So yes, my decision would stand and I did not desire to accept the Command."

"This decision was counter to everything I had been trained to do and the way I had been trained to think. I had to force myself to set aside organizational and peer pressures that could have shaped my decision. For me, to turn down Command had to be a willed decision. In other words, I acted contrary to my natural desires. The Army tends to inflate egos and self images and it's easy to get caught up in one's own self

importance. This type attitude seems to feed on itself. As an individual, I was very susceptible to this type behavior. It was easy for me to get caught up in mission and duty above all else. I was afraid of Command, but not afraid of many of the aspects that get so much attention, such as responsibility, pressure and risk. The only pressures I foresaw or risk I perceived were those of personally being able to balance the job and what I felt were my responsibilities to my family. The bottom line was - I was not willing to take that risk or pay that price in terms of family neglect in order to Command. In my mind I kept seeing the Colonel that I knew who, when his daughter got married, cried and said, "I really don't know who my daughter is; now she's gone." And the time my Battalion Command came to me and apologetically said that he was taking a two hour lunch in order to spend some time with his son, because he was going to college the next morning. The one thing in common that both of these gentlemen could never get back, once it had been lost, was that time with the family and having a chance to influence and know their children."

And some of the family concerns had an admixture of very poor timing.

In my particular case, the following factors were influential in my decision to decline command.

- I had just PCS'd from Europe with only a remote chance of activation from the alternate list (or so I was advised).
- I purchased rather than rented a home assuming 3 years of stabilization.
- I was on station only 2-1/2 months when notified of activation and would have been required to PCS from Texas to South Carolina 5 months later. The two equally unattractive options I had were to leave my family or sell my home at a loss.
- My daughter had just begun her freshman year at a local university. Choices were to uproot her during her freshman year or leave her here at non-resident rates and find her a place to live.
- I moved here with some thought of retiring at 20 years AFS.

"Had I been selected for command when promoted to O5 (PCSing to Europe) or activated upon completion of the 3 year USAREUR tour, I would have gladly accepted. Based on the timing of this activation, I was forced to weigh financial and family considerations against the privilege of command and declined. The issue was not one of accepting or declining command . . . it was one of accepting or declining an untimely PCS."

"I cannot speak for others, but I can tell you of my specific situation and the results and how I feel about it. I was selected as an alternate in my first consideration for battalion command in SC 15. I was not selected the second time around. Assuming I didn't have much chance any more, I opted for an assignment in the Washington, DC area, which is my home. My mother, who is widowed, lives here, as does my sister. My father passed away while I was in Germany, so I wanted to get back home again after 17 years of being nowhere near here. In essence, I felt certain moral obligations and wanted to settle down here and stay as long as possible. I also had a son entering his junior year and a daughter entering her sophomore year in high school. With this mind set, I went in up to my ears in getting all the house that I could afford."

"So what happens next, but I am a primary selectee on the command list in SC 15. This occurred after I had been working in the Pentagon for about 8 months. By this time the situation that faced me was this":

1. I owned a house that I couldn't sell without absorbing about a \$5,000 loss. I also couldn't afford to rent it and couldn't afford to leave my family here and go to the command unaccompanied. I wouldn't do the latter anyway for a host of reasons. Unfortunately, housing prices have not increased much, if any, since I bought my house.
2. My son was in his senior year during the time I would assume command and my daughter was entering it the next year. She is not well adjusted socially and a move then would have been traumatic to her.
3. Another son has a learning disability and is finally receiving effective assistance after having received none at all during my tour in Germany. I would be extremely reluctant to move him for a while.

"On the personal side, I am an Infantryman at heart and don't get that much enjoyment out of aviation. I had spent about six out of the last eight years in troop units at brigade, battalion and aviation company level (commander) and was feeling somewhat burnt out. I had also seen a lot of things happen that didn't enthrall me with the prospect of battalion command."

"My solution was to try and get an operational deferment with the support of my chain of command, thinking that the extra time would remove most of the above problems and rekindle my desire. This was attempted. In the meantime, I was slated to command an aviation battalion in the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault). This was perfect for my background and experience. Later my operational deferment was denied on the grounds that I would not have sufficient time to complete a

normal command tour prior to promotion to Colonel if deferred. I had no choice then but to make a decision that I would have much rather put off."

"To further complicate matters, my wife was diagnosed as having cervical cancer and was operated upon. Indications were that it was successful, but she required follow-up checks every 3 months at Walter Reed Army Medical Center."

"That was the development that made up my mind for sure, even though I had been leaning toward turning the command down before. So I did it. On her second checkup, they found another lump in the area where my wife's cervix used to be. They don't think it is a cancer, but she is scheduled for another operation very soon because they can't tell without operating. I feel I did the right thing."

"I do not plan on retiring soon, primarily because I can't afford to. However, I also don't plan on 'retiring on active duty.' I'm not that type and always strive to do the best job I can do on anything. I guess you could describe my feelings best as being hurt by the Army I have given my life to these past seventeen years. I just can't understand the impersonal policies which prevail in regard to command. They seem to say 'take it or leave it.' If you don't take it you become a second class citizen with no prospects for promotion. The implication also is that if you don't take command, you weren't fit for it anyway and they will replace you with someone who is. I wonder why they have boards then which are supposed to select those with the best potential for command? Why can't there be more flexibility or perhaps earlier selection?"

Color me a little bitter too!

As the preceding comments indicated, in addition to abiding concerns for family, there is a pervasive concern about the inflexibility of the command assignment process. To this end the comments of the declinees minored the comments of those officers who accepted command responsibility.

"Your comment concerning previous studies on declining command, 'The conclusions of the study were guarded' is about the same way MILPERCEN policies concerning command assignment is handled. Their policy seems to be that at the same time a board selected an individual for command, God gave them 10 commandments on assignment instructions. All decisions concerning the assignment are locked in concrete before the individual has any idea what is being considered. Everyone knows they have you over a barrel since you either take it as is, or lose the opportunity forever. Decline and you can start planning

for retirement since to decline an O-5 command also means you lost the opportunity for an O-6 command even if selected for promotion."

A. Made decision to decline command based on negative relationship with MILPERCEN:

- 1) Wanted me to go for precommand training during my honeymoon.
- 2) While on honeymoon, made unilateral changes to previously agreed precommand training arrangements.
 - a. Type schooling
 - b. Timing of TDY
 - c. TDY entitlements

B. After protracted negotiation with MILPERCEN, came to conclusion that Army didn't care about me as individual. Made firm decision to retire at 20 years. As result of this decision, following decisions were made:

- 1) Decline battalion level command. No purpose to break my back in extended command tour overseas when it no longer supports a career goal.
- 2) Must decline promotion to O-6 if offered. Can't afford additional service obligation.

C. All of above happened when:

- 1) I had 15 years service (all commissioned).
- 2) 1 year in grade as O-5.
- 3) Exceptionally good OER file.
- 4) Exceptionally successful company level comand in combat.

D. Outlook on Army prior to being offered command - Long term profession. Requires dedication, sacrifice, loyalty.

E. Current outlook on Army: Short term business; stepping stone to retirement benefits and civilian career in computer field.

I do not know why others decline command but my reasons are as follows:

- The unit I was slated for (511 MI BN) is to be reorganized and restationed within the next year. I presently am commanding a non OPMS unit in Heidelberg GE and had I accepted the 511th I would have moved my family to Nuernberg in June 82, then again to Augsburg in 83. These moves would have required me to place my 10th grade daughter in two more different high schools. This I found to be totally unacceptable.

Had I been able to remain in one location the decision would have been different.

- I also do not like the method of slating. Personnel are given no opportunity to contribute to the decisionmaking process and you "get stuck" with whatever happens to be available or opening up within a given time frame. If we are to continue to place emphasis on command at the O5/O6 level, I highly recommend more consideration be given to the individual requirements of someone from whom we (the Army) expect so much.

As was the case among those who accepted command, declinees saw a real distinction between TO&E commands and TDA command. Two lieutenant colonels declined command because they sought TO&E units and were slated for TDA units.

The reason I declined command was the fact that I was offered a training battalion vs. a TOE battalion. I did not feel that I would be competitive to go beyond O6 or to command a brigade. I would have accepted any tactical unit command in the Army.

Lack of positive Officer Personnel Management.

- a. Involuntary assignment as a Professor of Military Science (ROTC) upon completion of CGSC; denied an opportunity to go back to a TOE unit as requested. Specifically requested return to TOE assignment because (1) that is what I do best, (2) that is what I enjoy most, (3) would have enhanced my possibility of being selected to command a combat (TOE) Infantry Battalion.
- b. An assignment to a non TOE position prior to or during the command Selection process, specifically the slating process, inhibits the opportunity to be selected (slated) to command a Combat (TOE) Battalion.
- c. I specifically declined to "command" a Training Battalion. In my judgment, Selection to "Command" a Training Battalion is not synonymous with, or equivalent to, command of a Combat (TOE) Battalion.

And a third listed it as his principal reason for declining.

1. I had asked for a TOE battalion. I was never asked my preference, there was no discussion on slating whatsoever. I had a current preference statement on file. Some people want TNG CMDS - I did not, but I was not given a choice.

2. I was selected my second time considered. I was not an alternate the first time, so I made some preliminary decisions on not making another. Teen-age children, buying a home, wifely demands to put down roots became more important.

Other officers, who declined for a variety of reasons, all focused to a degree on the "MILPERCEN problem."

Declination of command on my part was based on three reasons:

"First, I had a very bad experience with an assignment officer, who relocated me on short notice and then within 90 days activated me in command. By that time I had purchased a house, based on the assignment officer's statement that my record wasn't good enough to command."

"Second, upon activation and notification of unit and assignment date, I realized that I would have completed 20 years of commissioned service prior to assuming command."

"Third, the slow down in promotions to O-6 meant, I would have at least 22+ years prior to promotions with a three year lock-in. I didn't want to spend 25+ years in the Army."

"Two years ago when I was first selected for command I was overwhelmed and delighted. I went to the pre-command course full of enthusiasm about returning to the field. My last ADA assignment was my first on active duty. In the intervening years I was cross trained in field artillery, was an adviser in Vietnam and then became involved in Personnel Management and Organizational Effectiveness (OE). Despite this drift away from ADA, I felt very confident about my ability to quickly adapt to the command environment and succeed."

"While in the pre-command course I was notified by MILPERCEN that the unit I was slated to command in Alaska was going to be inactivated and my alternate assignment was in Europe. Since one of my sons has a learning disability (LD) which requires special education support, I contacted the DOD Dependent Schools office in USAREUR and even spoke to the principal of the school my son would attend to find out what support was available. Much to my disappointment it was evident that special education resources were non-existent or too far away. I told MILPERCEN I could not in good conscience accept an assignment which would jeopardize my son's educational development. So under the Handicapped Dependent Program regulation, I was deferred a year. In the interim I worked with MILPERCEN to estimate my future command assignment options and proceeded to personally contact several CONUS installations to determine the availability and adequacy of LD education support. I even submitted a memorandum of my findings and preferences to MILPERCEN well in advance of the next command

list."

"The next year I was slated for a command in Korea, which would have stabilized my family and assured continuity of educational support for my son. Although I did not relish a hardship tour, it was acceptable under the circumstances. About two weeks after the slating, I was again told by MILPERCEN that JCS just decided to inactivate the unit and turn it over to the ROK Army. My options were to command a training unit in CONUS or a TOE unit in Europe. Unfortunately both options were unacceptable due to my son's education needs. So I was deferred another year. I had a hard time believing (and still do) that MILPERCEN, ODCSOPS and Eighth Army had no idea at all when JCS might decide to inactivate the unit. Repeated attempts to find out why this problem occurred for two consecutive years were answered by "It's just the way the system worked sometimes." Furthermore, the command deferral and slating process was not very responsive to the Handicapped Dependents Program objective. Although MILPERCEN seemed supportive and understanding, the administrative machinery was lacking to determine the availability and quality of special education resources at various installations, world wide. The burden was on me to contact all the installations and obtain background information. If I had not been stationed in the Pentagon with easy access to autovon lines, I never would have been able to do this research. Some central information file is sorely needed."

"At this point, I seriously questioned whether or not I wanted to command, especially when the next assignment would result in being in the middle of the tour at the 20 year mark. I discussed my concerns with several people in MILPERCEN and was told that (1) command was essential if I wanted to be promoted and selected for SSC since no ADA officer has been promoted to colonel without a successful O-5 command, (2) my assignments after command would probably be in personnel management or OE and that "good jobs" in these areas were dependent on having commanded, (3) furthermore if OE became an OPMS speciality so I could drop ADA and decline command -- which seemed reasonable given my background -- my promotability and assignments would be severely limited, (4) my chances of an O-6 ADA command were very slim given my background, the limited number of commands, and whether or not my O-5 command was of a TOE unit. Since I was eventually slated for a TDA battalion command, this meant that the command tour boiled down to a "ticket punch" which would simply enhance my promotability, selection to SSC, and consideration for "good jobs" in non-ADA assignments, and (5) during the past three years ODCSPER has creatively ignored repeated recommendations to make OE a speciality and has given no indication of seriously considering this recommendation in the immediate future."

"So at age 41 with about a year to go before I can retire, I discovered that I really want and need a change of career and life style. It's not that I wouldn't enjoy command or that I

fear failure. On balance the minuses outweigh the pluses. I cannot justify pursuing a "ticket punch" and regret that OE has never been made a speciality with some career incentives for repetitive tours without having commanded. Generalists with command experience should be rewarded, but an overemphasis on having commanded at a time when opportunities are limited severely dilutes the credibility of OPMS. Furthermore, the incentives for O-6 and general officer rank are primarily intrinsic since the tangible incentives have been constantly decreased over the past decade. I have, therefore, reached a career impasse amidst these professional dilemmas."

Reasons why officers decline command tours should not be guarded. I suppose the truth hurts.

"A chance for a third long tour to USAREUR with a 20 month turn-around is not fun. The numerous relocations in the past ten years is too much to ask of any one, unfortunately my specialties Crypto/EW and aviation require that. The unexpected notice from MILPERCEN that your command courses begin next week at Ft. Leavenworth is not the way to be informed that you've been pulled up from the alternate list. Schooling considerations for my children played a heavy part in this decision."

"No sour grapes! Industry offers a better way to go and the Army knows that."

"Three officers declined because of the peculiarities of their promotion situations."

"My own decision was based on inordinately unique circumstances. I hold a reserve component grade of O-6 and would be required to give it up if I integrated to RA status and served beyond my 20 year MRD. The timing of my selection and slating would have resulted in a PCS with less than 14 months to serve as a battalion commander before my MRD."

"In the absence of the above contingencies I would have most certainly accepted a command assignment."

"I can only relate to my specific reasons and have attached experts from my letter of declination."

1. Since I found out I was on the primary O5 Command List approximately a year ago, I have had mixed emotions about this obviously great honor for which very few officers are selected.
2. First, I did not believe it as I am not a CG&S graduate and had over twenty years active commissioned service either factor of which should have eliminated me from any consideration. When I did determine that it was, in fact, true I felt that my slim chances for O6 had been enhanced considerably although I could foresee a possible personal

dilemma.

3. This crisis was realized when last year's 06 primary zone of selection was announced and I missed the cutoff date by 2 days! My situation was (and is) that I would not know the results of the next 06 board until approximately April/May 1982 and my European Command assumption date was scheduled for June/July 1982. If I were selected for 06, I would not assume command but would have already attended most of the pre-command courses/TDY and would have begun preparing to move to Germany. Additionally, the alternate selectee and MACOM would have no prior notice and would be forced to compress various actions. If I were not selected, I would have no desire to command as "passed over" LTC and would not think it would be fair to the MACOM as well. However, by the time (April/May 1982) I would have no option to get off orders except to retire. Further, if I turned down command then that fact would probably be known to the 06 promotion board and would "kill" any changes I may have had.
4. I wrestled with this situation throughout last year discussing the options and alternatives with various personnel, including MILPERCEN. Their suggestions were to hold off making any final decisions until first part of 1982 and then to discuss with assignments representative.
5. I would prefer to have MILPERCEN consider these factors and voluntarily withdraw my name from the command list. However, if this cannot be accomplished, I have no choice but to decline command and this letter hereby transmits that request.

"For my nearly 21 years of service I have firmly believed that command is the ultimate. I was therefore very excited about being selected for battalion level command even though I had over 19 years of service at the time. Subsequently, however, I declined. I did so very regretfully. It was an honor to be selected to command, particularly so since I was one of the few in the MP Corps so selected. Declining was a hard decision, which I believe I was forced to do."

"Although notified in February 1981 that I was selected to command, I was not slated to assume command until July 1982. Those 17 months put me at the over 21 year time frame before I was to assume command of a battalion. Had I been slated immediately, I would have moved out the next day, even though I was surprised to have been selected at so late a time in my career."

"Circumstances changed which caused me to decline. As I saw younger officers assume command I waited. In the meantime I came into the primary zone for Colonel. I was informed by MILPERCEN that should I be selected for promotion, I would be removed from the command list, even though it would be just a

few weeks before I assumed command that the promotion list would be released. I was also informed that should I be passed over, command of a battalion at that time would not help my being picked up and that I had a less than one percent chance of being picked up on a second go-round. Now I was faced with a dilemma."

"I discussed my concern with MILPERCEN and was told that I could do nothing. If I chose to decline command later based on the release of the 06 promotion list, there would be no problem and that I could stay in my current job. One day I received a call from MILPERCEN stating that I had to make a decision immediately. If I was selected for promotion I would be pulled from the command list at the last minute. However, if I was passed over and then declined command, I would be moved from my present job because they were going to fill it. This seemed unfair, since I would remain in my job if selected for promotion, but would be moved if passed over and declined command. I still had the option for assuming command even if passed over. Rather than disrupt my family for the ninth time in 10 years and remove my son during his senior year in high school, I declined command. I had no desire to be a passed over commander, nor do I want to be a 28 year LTC."

"My letter of declination advised MILPERCEN of my belief in command and the honor I felt to have been selected. However, to assume a battalion command after 21 years only if I am passed over for Colonel did not seem right. I was also told that if the 06 promotion board heard of my declination, I would not be selected for promotion. Certainly that is now what OPMS is all about."

"My opinion is that the 17 months from time of selection to planned assumption of command was too long. I could have been happily in command of a battalion right now. MILPERCEN could have put some personal in personnel and slated me sooner to avoid the situation. As it is now, I am looked on as an officer who does not want to command -- a kiss of death. Not true, but realistic. OPMS still does not equalize staff and command."

Finally, two officers declined for what were essentially religious reasons.

"My single reason for declining command is that I have been called by the Lord God Almighty to serve Him full time upon completion of my current tour and retirement from active duty in the summer of 1983. Many professional soldiers serve God and country throughout their careers. They and you, like I, fulfill the scripture from the Apostle Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians, Chapter 4, Verse 1 - 'I therefore, the prisoner of the Lord, beseech you that ye walk worthy of the vocation wherewith ye are called.' For over 22 years I have done my best to walk worthy as an American soldier. Now God is call-

ing me into another vocation in accordance with Phillipians 3:14 - "I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

"God willing, it is my intent to continue to serve faithfully in my current assignment, to complete my normal tour and to retire with my family in Alaska. Upon retirement, I will pursue studies at the Charismatic Bible College of Anchorage, Alaska, and eventually serve the Lord Jesus Christ in a full time capacity."

"As PCS time started approaching again, being a committed Christian, I went to prayer. The Lord led me to seek to stay in Tampa. I identified an O5 slot in the local ROTC organization, pursued it and got it. I PCS'd in May, went to ROTC Advanced Camp, and was one month into the school year when I was "activated" off the alternate list. I asked to be command deferred so I could at least finish the current academic year but my ROTC Region Commander would not support me. I went back to prayer and the Lord told me it was not yet time for me to leave Tampa. So I declined."

As we indicated in the introduction to this chapter, the similarities between the comments of the lieutenant colonels and the colonels are substantially greater than the dissimilarities. While there is substantial concern about accepting command when the rewards for such service appear to be declining, the officers who voiced this concern, to a man, accepted the responsibility of command. Similarly, those who accepted command raised major concerns about command environment and tour length. In both cases their arguments seemed to be for greater command freedom of action, as if to say it is not the tour length that is the problem, the problem is higher headquarters and commanders imposing a pace that cannot be maintained for thirty consecutive months.

But the issues that led to declination were not those of reward/benefit, command environment or tour length. The declinations primarily arose from the Hobson's choice: The Army or my Family. When those officers who are placed in the dilemma are given an added dose of personnel callousness they find less reason to strike the balance in favor of the Army. Moreover, when there is a family health problem or a

clear detriment to children's education such as a learning disability problem, not even exceptionally good personnel action will lead the officer to accept command.

CHAPTER VII

C&GSC WRITTEN COMMENTS

From the Leavenworth sample 144 officers returned written comments. While these comments were less lengthy than those of the command selectees, they tended to focus on similar concerns. Their responses were, of course, hypothetical in that they had not yet had the opportunity to accept or decline CCSS command, but these responses illuminated many of their seniors' answers.

Only six issues raised more than a 10% level of interest in this group, and none of these issues related to the problems of slating, timing and assignment to specific commands. As would be expected, family issues dominated. However, there was an expression of concern over command environment issues, and two closely related topics - cost to benefit and command tour length - drew substantial responses.

The concerns of the Leavenworth officers who provided written comments are listed below.

1. Adverse effect on the family	51%
2. Inadequate return for effort expended and risk taken	42%
3. Undesireable command environment	40%
4. Excessive command tour length	25%
5. Adverse effect on children's education	17%
6. Adverse effect on wife's employment	12%
7. Inadequate compensation (Pay)	8%
8. Centralized Command Selection System	7%
9. Attraction to Retirement	7%
10. Lack of Personal Qualification	7%
11. PCS	7%
12. Type Unit - TOE v TDA	5%

13. Undesireable Location - Overseas	5%
14. Inappropriate Timing	4%
15. Undersireable Location (Other than Overseas)	4%
16. Desireability of Current Assignment	4%
17. Gamesmanship	3%
18. The process of slating for a command	2%
19. Health	1%

This discussion will focus first on the principal concern of the Leavenworth cohort - that of family. Over half of the C&GSC sample (51%) saw obligations to family as the most important detractor to accepting command responsibility. For the most part the officers expressed desire to assume command, but they believed that the Army's family support system is inadequate to the task.

"I personally would stay in the Army for thirty years and command as much as possible. The decline of command problem is not the fear of command itself but the fear of what it will do to the family. If it was possible to insure my family received adequate medical support (this in most cases is perceived the I care attitude is not there). In Europe this is especially bad. It is true that my wife gets better service when I go with her while in uniform. In spite of the propaganda about DODSEUR schools, my wife thinks they stink. (probably brought about because both my sons received good grades while in Europe but had to be put back one grade upon return to CONUS)."

"Being able to buy a home in the area you would like to is also a problem. At my next assignment I am told I cannot move off post and buy a house (lose my housing allowance) even though I am going to my home state where I pay taxes and the town where I want to retire. There are areas where a little consideration and thought would make all the difference in the world. I would personally love to command but my family's support means I probably will get out at 20 years and decline command if offered."

And, as the respondent above indicated, where the Army was perceived to be adversely affecting family requirements, the officer would not feel obliged to accept command.

"First, I must say that I truly want a BN command, and would in fact like two - one as infantryman and one as an aviator. I am in the Army to be a soldier and go to war when called upon with a great desire to do what I do best, which I think is lead troops. The only times I would consider turning down a command would be when it moved me and my family during either of my childrens time in high school, particularly their last two years. What I would do is go take the command and have the family follow me later. At this time

in my life I have learned that my family is a critical part in my career decisions . . . I would accept a command in Korea unaccompanied at any time. If given a command during the school I believe I would have my family follow me at a school break - Christmas or Summer."

As with their superiors, many of the C&GSC officers viewed the problem as being related to command environment.

"Basically, too much time is spent at the office, away from the family, working on bureaucratic, meaningless trivia (of crisis importance)."

"Soldiers today are more family oriented and find the long days (typical 0600 - 2000 hours in the 7th ID) to be too much of a strain on family when compared with gains."

"By the time an officer becomes available for higher level command (BN and up) his career is assured, he normally has reevaluated his priority in terms of family or career - normally giving greater priority to family. These conditions coupled with the all too frequent "heartaches and hardships" of command often caused by senior commanders who have forgotten their experiences at lower levels, combine to make command unattractive."

Within the category of family concerns, and fifth on the priority list of all concerns, was the issue of schooling for the officers' children (17%).

"Once children enter high school they should be allowed to stay there and graduate . . . Problem No. 1 is the movement of families at the wrong time of school year."

And within the schooling category the schools in Europe, particularly the boarding schools, were singled out as detractors from command.

"USAREUR High Schools are:

1. Inadequate

2. Not competitive for University selection

Therefore, people with high school age children are HESITANT to go to USAREUR to command, or for that matter, go to USAREUR for any assignment."

"The situation with boarding high school students in USAREUR is terrible. In my opinion the kids are not properly supervised and do pretty much what they want to do."

"I will not accept command anywhere where I must board my children so they can go to high school. The Frankfurt High School is the

classic disaster."

Sixth on the priority list, but raised by only 12% of this group, was the issue of spousal employment. For reasons that are not apparent, only one of the officers who raised this issue amplified his concerns.

"Quite often the officer's wife is working -- to save for children's college educations, to make house payments, or whatever -- and most officers know that their wives are expected to do volunteer work while their husbands command. Besides that, many wives enjoy their outside employment. When battalion command becomes a family commitment, the wife's interests and contributions must be considered equally with the husband's. If military compensation continues to lag behind the cost of living respectably, this situation will become more acute."

The Leavenworth cohort saw the issue of benefit to cost ratio as starkly as their seniors. 42% of the C&GSC class raised this issue as opposed to 28% of the colonels and 39% of the lieutenant colonels. The Leavenworth comments were more briefer, but equally heartfelt.

"Why should an officer elect to accept a job that is high risk and long hours when one can pursue a non command job and make the same money while still making a contribution to the Army?"

"Risk is disproportionate to reward. No-chance to-fail still is the rule for commanders."

"Perception that the rewards are not there. The Army sends two conflicting messages which cannot be reconciled."

1. To those selected for command "you're going places."
2. To others "you can make it in your secondary, without command."

"Then when "good" BN commanders are not selected for COL, the message becomes more muddled."

And, as was the case with their seniors, this group also saw the families as a primary bearer of the command burden.

"The pressures and risks of command are very high. Additionally, this extra pressure and strain adversely impacts on the family. I believe the battalion level command opportunity comes at a time when many officers become more aware and concerned about the needs of the family. When the individual officer weighs the rewards

against the risks, especially the impact on the family -- the family takes precedence."

"The pressures of command, particularly during peacetime (statistics, no freedom to fail, etc) probably for a number of officers to question whether or not command is worth the risk (to one's career) as well as the adverse impact on the family. As long as the "party line" espouses that an officer can be successful without command, more and more officers will question whether or not they should accept command. With the undue sense of urgency that is prevalent in most troop units, commanders will have to choose between their unit and their family - a choice none of us ever wants to face and have difficulty rationalizing during peacetime. Assignments to five battalions have convinced me that essentially the two, command and family life, are incompatible. Therefore, the personal and professional risks involved influence many officers to decline command."

Almost as significant as the cost of benefit issue among the Leavenworth cohort was the implication that because of adverse command environment the opportunity to command is not highly regarded. 40% of these officers objected to present day command environments, as opposed to 29% of the lieutenant colonels and 16% of the colonels. Some of these officers were seriously alienated.

"The Army officer corps is in disarray considering its the many directions/directives with our leaders -- we don't know whether an officer should fight, kill, or manager/manage role play."

"There are no command prerogatives remaining today. He wears the green tabs, but his ability to lead or create is not taxed, because the "commander" today is force-fed directives and double-checked from day-one. Ask any company commander of an infantry unit, when was the last time he was given ample ammo, training equipment, and time (space) to conduct his own training without higher command supervision/ control or denied of such."

"Suffice, there is no appeal of commanding troops, today. The "troops" are questionable in motivation and ability as well! The "best jobs" (command) are no longer attractive to me because they have become so encumbered with minutiae and pretense! Better yet -- ask those 11.2% LTC, who turned down command or 17% colonels who rejected BDE in 1981."

"As a company commander in USAREUR (total captivity: approximately 32 mos, on 2 different tours), I never had a BN commander (4 different 0-5's) who enjoyed being the "commander." Most were too busy reacting to changing policy's, priorities and pressures to be an effective leader. After almost 3 years of that nonsense I was completely soured on the "opportunity" for BN command. Why should

I work myself to the extreme doing a challenging job that is neither enjoyable (fun) or rewarding."

"Not worth BS . . . to babysit grown men and put up with childishness of TOE Commanders. They continue to thrash in a sea of minutia and miss the important aspects of our Army -- I want no part of the command process -- unless it was a short tour -- I don't have the time to waste my life and my families life for those type troubles/headaches."

But most were just disillusioned.

"Pressure of fighting "numbers game," successes or failures based on re-up rates, AWOL, sick call. No assessment of unit's ability to really perform its mission. Admittedly, the re-up rate, etc can be indicative of a unit to an extent but its not all inclusive, but an SIR always seems to outweigh a good FTX."

"Today's Army is a bit of a "pain" in terms of wavering policy on women, questionable effectiveness of PT program and still too much politics. We still have too many senior commander's who want to "look good" for personal career reasons and can't face up to or support commanders in their world of human error."

"Fear Factor - Leadership by fear on the point of 05's 6's and 7's In some cases 0-8's -- creates unacceptable climate for command -- Troops and junior leaders suffer and don't experience any training benefit. Problems of drugs, alcoholism, maintenance etc still great and military's ability to cope on decline. Current attitude in military is to encourage subordinates to "do your best" yet military lends no assistance."

If there was a response from this group that could be described as unexpected it was their concern about "excessive" command tour length. The concerns they expressed seldom related to their reduced opportunity for command. Almost invariably they were worried about "their" commander who had burnt out under the present system. This concern particularly focused on USAREUR.

"The 30 \pm 6 tour is satisfactory only for a CONUS assignment. I speak from experience when I say this; as I commanded a company in USAREUR for 24 months under the same Battalion Commander. He had served 3 months prior to my change of command. At 24 months he and his family were burnt out. I remember both his and my biggest "bitch." Turnover of personnel was so high that one could never reach a state of continuity. Finally a different set of command tour lengths should be developed for":

Alaska	24 months <u>+6</u>
Hawaii	24 months <u>+6</u>
CONUS	30 months <u>+6</u>
Germany	24 months <u>+6</u>
Korea	18 months <u>+6</u>
Panama	18 months <u>+6</u>
Japan	24 months <u>+6</u>
Okinawa	18 months <u>+6</u>
Italy etc	24 months <u>+6</u>
Greece	18 months <u>+6</u>
England	24 months <u>+6</u>
Europe	18 months <u>+6</u>

"In USAREUR the commander is under constant pressure to excel for too long a period. The tour length is too long!"

"In my opinion a command overseas is a different situation vs CONUS. I understand the need to stabilize tour length for a Commander but the length is just too long. I believe 24 months with the option to stay 36 months."

But not all the respondents thought the 30 month tour was the problem.

"The three years battalion command tour is good for soldiers, units, and the Army. It is often not good for battalion commanders, especially when they take over with the plan of undoing everything the previous commander had done. These commanders used to burn out in 18 months because of 20 hour days spent attending to minutia. Many LTC's envision their 36 months of command spent doing exactly that. Somewhere along the officer development line we (the Army collectively) are doing a poor job training officers that they don't always have to be working at peak efficiency."

The Centralized Command Selection System did not rate high on the list of concerns of the C&GSC group (7%). But those who raised the issue thought the goals (select those best qualified to command) were not being matched by the results.

"CCSS probably insures that the "best qualified" are selected for 05/06 command; the question that nags, however, is how do you define "best qualified." Those Washington "wunderkind" who manage to break loose from the DA staff cocoon long enough to punch that 05/06 Command ticket, and then return to the womb from which they came, are here to stay it appears. It's the only game in town -- but why do they decline command at such increasing rates each year??"

"Persons who decline did so because they were probably picked as a good staff officer probably at MILPERCEN and DA rather than what they accomplished as commanders. The persons who have shown to be

the best commanders in command assignments should be selected for higher commands. I do not feel commanders are selected because of past performance as commanders."

"Frankly, after reviewing the current command selection list I am quite disappointed. When will the command board realize that graduation from West Point or a Ph.D doesn't qualify a man for command? I personally know four of the selectees on this list. All are good men and extremely bright, however, three have not the foggiest notion of how to lead or relate to soldiers. I feel very sure that their commands will be disastrous, if not for them personally, then surely for the battalions they will lead. ----- Please, please, please, someone wake up and get the message -- being an intellectual doesn't mean that that person should command!"

"I have little knowledge of the old system for selection commanders. From my observations after four years in an armored division prior to coming to CGSC (two years commanding a company in a mech battalion, a year as the Materiel Officer in the division maintenance battalion, six months as the XO of the DMMC, and six months as a FASCO), I know that only about 50% of all battalion commanders selected to command have the necessary qualifications, knowledge, and -- most important -- the real leadership traits to command a battalion successfully in combat. I don't know that the old selection system was any better, but at least then senior commanders appeared to be less hesitant to replace a weak commander."

-- I really don't know enough of the old system to adequately make a meaningful answer. My perception is that something is wrong, but returning to the old system may not correct the problem.

-- If we can't do better than a 50% quality/competency selection rate, we need to change the selection system, or at least find out what standards or criteria are most important for selection of real leaders: men who are thoroughly knowledgeable in their fields, and men who know how to command in combat.

-- It may be that our career management/rating system will not allow for identification of more than 50% competency rates for battalion command using a centralized system.

And one officer saw a serious problem arising from using the CCSS for other than combat arms command selections.

"Combat Arms and Combat Service Support Arms are not the same and when leaders refuse to face facts they get invalid responses. If the level of concern were reduced almost 50% on this subject and only applied to those really affected, we could work on problems associated with winning the next war. This reflects the wind set of top leaders, who are combat arms, to try to fit all officers (80,000 people) into one mold. I personally resent being told 'you

have to command to get promoted." My idea is to do my job well to insure that we win. I expect and demand proper pay and advancement for doing that, command does not enter into the equation."

While the design of CCSS raised few comments, and its operation only slightly more, the mechanics of the slating system, which were a matter of major concern to the command selectees, were not perceived as a significant problem to the Leavenworth cohort. Only 2% perceived slating in general as a problem. 4% thought timing might be a problem, particularly as it might relate to being required to sell a house on short notice or move a family in the middle of a school year. And, although the issue of TDA vs TOE commands was of concern to 5% of this cohort, even concerning this aspect of the slating process they were less jaded than their seniors.

This group perceived that retirement was a cause of declining command only half as frequently as their seniors (05-15%) (06-16%). Among the C&GSC group that saw retirement as a reason for declining command (7%), the majority expressed the following belief:

The responsibilities of command are not important to a twenty year career.

Others phrased the issue more in terms of command environment.

"However, I feel a key reason is their decision not to stay in beyond 20 years due to second career interest. The pressures of a battalion command in the US Army, especially those caused by senior officers (which I believe are often unnecessary), are a lot for an intelligent officer to take. If this were his last assignment, or almost last, I don't think he would be willing to put up with such frustrations."

The written comments of the Leavenworth cohort came closer to mirroring the colonels than they did the lieutenant colonels with respect to the declination of command. Opposed: CGSC 10%; Colonels 13%; Lieutenant Colonels 5%. And among the Leavenworth group the expressions of disapprobation were every bit as caustic as was the case

with the colonels.

"Officers decline because they are unfit technically or psychologically for command -- checked out of the net due to careerist motives. That is their own personal comfort and desires take precedence over their responsibilities to lead. These comments apply to combat arms officers only -- I have not observed CS or CSS officers."

1. Lack of commitment to the profession.
2. Putting personal business ahead of the profession.

-- Many are afraid to command and lead troops, they are to comfortable in technician aspects of the various career fields and are apprehensive about being with troops.

-- My perception is that only a very few have valid reasons for declining command.

- (1) They are selfish
- (2) Family considerations (as indicated in survey)
- (3) Already retired in place
- (4) Goals of Army not goals of officer

"Since I can't imagine anyone turning down command assignments, I find it difficult to judge their motives. I personally can think of no good reason for turning down command - whether this is because I'm single or the way I was brought up. I really can't pinpoint it - but my gut reaction is that those who turn down command basically question their own ability to succeed and faced with that pressure - decline."

And one concluded that the offending officers' records should be annotated appropriately.

"If anyone turns down the honor of being offered a command, his written declination of command should be made a part of his official military file for consideration in all future personnel/promotion actions."

The Leavenworth officers reflected the attitude of their seniors to a great extent. If there is a difference it is that the Leavenworth respondents are even more concerned about their families than are their seniors. This difference bodes ill for a system that consistently makes a practice of forcing the officer to make choices between his family and the Army.

The attitude of the Leavenworth officers toward the declining

benefits of senior command bolsters strongly their seniors' perceptions. Similarly, the younger officers' perception of a command environment that focuses on the negative rather than the positive, supports the conclusion that it is not just the self-interest of the Lieutenant Colonels that caused their concern about command environment.

Finally, the absence of complaints about MILPERCEN from this group adds credence to the expressions of dissatisfaction by their seniors. It is not general dissatisfaction with MILPERCEN that the senior officers are concerned about. The displeasure relates solely to the operation of the personnel administration system subsequent to command selection.

CHAPTER VIII

DISCUSSION

Statistical data derived directly from the questionnaire in the cases of 05 and 06 selectees should be considered reliable. The sample sets in each case represent a select group from within a larger cohort. No inferences should be drawn regarding similar attitudes among non-command selected 05s and 06s Army-wide. The intent of the study was to examine the command selection and slating process from the vantage of those selected and then examine any parallel responses from a statistically small sample of a much larger cohort, the officers yet to enter the selection consideration window, as represented by the CGSC group. In the case of the CGSC responses, in all probability, gross sensitivities to key variables can be inferred, but further investigation will be necessary of selected issues based on indicators revealed by this study. Equally, note that analysis of the written comments submitted by respondents is completely subjective. It was based on a simple matrix which arrayed issue areas. Comments relevant to each issue area were evaluated by the study group members. Consensus of the group placed comments in the various categories and frequency percentages were developed. This analysis can be used to evaluate the strength of attitudes in several key areas, but the basic questionnaire derived statistics are the foundation of the study.

This discussion focuses on the most significant observations made

from available data and does not necessarily correspond with the order of the questions as found in the survey instrument.

The study showed generally strong satisfaction with the Centralized Command Selection System (CCSS) from both primary and alternate selectees as well as those who declined. This positive perception is further reinforced by consistently positive comments concerning command as a personal goal, at the time of selection among 05/06 respondents, and the CGSC respondents clearly favor a centralized process. Dissatisfaction clearly enters the picture after selection, as the mechanics of the slating process begins. Slating will be discussed at greater length in a subsequent paragraph.

While there is strong support from all three respondent groups for continuing to publish the command list, (78% 05, 82% 06, 84% CGSC), the issue of publication of the alternate selectee list was not addressed. Narrative comments and data generated in response to other questions suggests that publication of the full command selectee list should be investigated. The comments and other data implies that there is a high degree of uncertainty generated by not knowing one's status and position. 38% of the alternate selectees, for example, responded negatively to the selection notification process and 27% of the primary selectees did also at the 06 level. Among 05 selectees, 16% of the alternates and 25% of the primary selectees responded negatively to the command selection notification process.

Perhaps the most compelling set of negative responses were generated from questions dealing directly or indirectly with the slating process. The range of issues considered under the heading of slating included, time allotted to accomplish PCS, length of assignment at pre-

command duty station, assignment to TOE vs TDA command, timing of the offer to command, the scheduling of attendance at pre-command courses, and the nature of personal contacts with action officers at MILPERCEN, the latter three being taken from narrative comments provided by respondents.

First, 93% of all 06 commands and 90.4% of 05 commands involved a PCS. This appears inordinately high, but may be unavoidable as diversity of location and type of command are considered. However, 50% of the 06 respondents and 41% of the 05s were afforded 90 days or less in which to accomplish the PCS. This was supported by 49.9% of the 06 primary selectees and 52.1% of the 06 alternates. Among 05's, 39.2% of the primaries and 48% of the alternates reported similar experiences. 49% of the 06 selectees and 83.9% of the 05 group reported less than two years at their pre-command duty station. Among 05 declinees 34.3% indicated influence to decline based on the type command offered. Strong narrative comments from respondents also indicate negative influences to accept if faced with command of a TDA unit. Timing of the offer of command among 06's produced a 16% influence to decline and among 05's 21% reported the same influence. Again, the complete picture on the slating dilemma is brought into sharp focus by narrative comments which recounted numerous instances of callous, insensitive responses by MILPERCEN action officers.

The 30 ± 6 month command tour length drew significant negative responses. Only 25% of the 06 respondents indicated command tour length as a positive influence toward acceptance as did only 20.9% of the 05 respondents. Most saw it as a neutral influence, but in the case of 06's, 15% responded with tour length as an influence toward declination and 20.5% of 05's did the same. This data is amplified in another

question where 50% of the responses among 06's and 49.2% among 05's reflect positive feelings about the command tour length. However, on the same question, in 35% of the 06's cases and 30.6% of the 05's, feelings toward current command tour length were negative. Narrative comments suggest that one source of discontent is that while command tour lengths are lengthened, turbulence in lower command and staff positions and in the general officer ranks creates a command environment which is extremely trying. Narrative comments also reveal concern over the generally reduced command opportunities available to field grade officers because of extended tour lengths. The implicit message may be purely career motivated, as the majority of all respondents clearly indicated that promotion potential and other career opportunities are enhanced by successful command. The CGSC responses were generally consistent with the command selectee responses, 58.2% considered 30 \pm months too long and 30.8% viewed the tour length as an influence to decline command.

When asked to reflect an opinion on the command selection notification process, 30% of all 06 respondents indicated a negative opinion as did 22.3% of the 05's. When broken out according to primary or alternate selectee status, among 06's 27.3% of the primaries and 39.1% of the alternates responded negatively. Likewise among 05's, 24.8% of the primary selectees and 16.4% of the alternates reflected negative opinions concerning notification procedures.

It is very interesting to note that the survey instrument revealed very positive attitudes toward the Army and command selection. For example, from 06 to the CGSC group, positive attitudes toward the Army were, respectively 83%, 80.9% and 72.7%. Likewise attitudes toward

selection for command reflected 83% positive among 06's 82.1% among 05's and when the CGSC group was asked their family's attitude if offered a command today, 56.6% indicated influence toward accepting command. These strong responses are modified somewhat as factors concerning declination influences surfaced. Family influence to accept command among 06 selectees was still 47%, but 18% indicated family influence to decline command and 33% reported neutral family influence. The 05 respondents had a similar distribution. It appears that as the specifics of the command opportunity unfold, for example, location, time of the projected move, time made available for PCS and others become operative in the decision process, family support weakens. The problem is clearly illustrated among 05 declinee responses. Narrative comments from respondents further amplify this picture.

In investigating specific factors, such as location of command, perceptions of command environment and type command, there was an apparent shift in importance from the 06 respondents to the CGSC group. Responses from 06's indicate fairly positive influences toward acceptance of command when weighing these factors. However, among 05 respondents, 15.6% of all responses showed location as an influence to decline and among 05 declinees 51.4% reported location as an influence toward declination. Likewise, the command environment influenced 17.1% of all 05's toward declination and 45.7% of the declinees viewed it negatively. Type command influences toward declination from 05 respondents showed a 12.9% influence toward declination and from 05 declinees 34.3% reported type command influenced them toward declination. In the CGSC group, a command in an unaccompanied area produced a 24.6% response indicating influence toward declination. This negative influence grew markedly as the considerations of mid-school year moves with respect to command were

included.

The option outlining a mid-school year move to USAREUR with high school age children received 53.4% responses toward declination from the CGSC group and a USAREUR boarding school conditions for children received 70.2% responses indicating influence toward declination. Narrative comments from the CGSC group also provide a vivid picture of perceptions concerning the command environment. Finally, type unit to be commanded will apparently be an important factor according to CGSC responses. For example only 30.6% viewed slating for a TDA Training Battalion as an influence toward acceptance, while 29.9% indicated a TDA Training Battalion assignment would be an influence toward declination. Only 9.4% indicated a TDA unit appropriate to their branch and specialty as their first choice for type command.

While spouses' employment apparently figures prominently in the decision process with respect to command, survey data suggests this factor will become more important in the future. Among 06's 49% report spouses not employed and only an 11% of the responses indicated this factor would be an influence toward declination. The 05's had 43.7% spouse not employed and 13.7% of the responses indicated influence toward declination. The CGSC group responses showed that 30.1% would be influenced to accept or decline based on spouse career requirements.

A surprisingly large number of respondents were homeowners. Among 06 selectees 79% reported homeownership and 67.7% of the 05 respondents were also. This suggests that economic factors involving sale or rental of property may significantly influences the command acceptance or declination decision. The CGSC group indicated in 19.5% of the cases, this would influence a decision toward declination. It is important to

note that 67.3% of the CGSC respondents were neutral on the issue and might be negatively influenced by conditions prevailing at the time of the command related decision.

Survey data revealed that many O6, O5, and CGSC respondents have not had recent battalion level experience. 59% of the O6 selectees had not served in a battalion in 4 or more years as did 62.2% of the O5's and 56.1% of the CGSC respondents.

The issue of declination of command received varied responses, with more senior officers tending toward favoring diminution of career opportunities for declinees and more junior officers favoring a more balanced approach. The importance of declination before versus after slating was key in all groups. 52% of the O6 respondents indicated an officer should be permitted to decline command without subsequent adverse affect, but when placed in the post-slating declination situation only 21% supported declination without prejudice. The O5 data revealed that 66% favored permitting declination without adverse effect and in the post slating situation the percentage dropped to 39.9% favoring declination without prejudice. The CGSC group responded with 73.8% favoring declination without subsequent adverse affect and 44.4% still felt post-slating declination should be permitted without prejudice. This shift in attitudes may well reflect that senior officer selectees have capitalized on their opportunity and are not tolerant of those who opt for other courses of action, as well as the fact that from the O6 level to the CGSC group, OPMS philosophy is operative in differing depths.

At the request of O5 Command management branch, the survey investigated a hypothetical requirement to complete a full command tour after being promoted to the next higher grade than required for a specific command. Over 50% all respondents viewed the proposal negatively.

Approximately 30% of all respondents viewed tour completion after promotion positively.

CHAPTER IX

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The study group analyzed the data and comments and reached the following conclusions.

1. The centralized command selection system was favored over the previous system of command selection by the majority of all respondents. It should be noted however, that significant numbers of O-5 and O-6 selectees favored allowing MACOM commanders more influence in the slating process.

2. Respondents overwhelmingly favored publication of the command selection list. Publication of an alternate selection list was not directly addressed in the questionnaires utilized.

3. There were strong feelings among some command selectee respondents that the slating process was impersonal, inequitable, inflexible and excessively secretive.

4. Significant numbers of respondents in all categories feel that the current command tour length is too long. Factors contributing of this observation appear to include a perception that the command environment and pace of events is too intense for that length of command; that stabilization of O-5 and O-6 command tours without stabilization of layers of command and staff laterally, above and below those levels is ineffective and a feeling that lengthening of command tours

denies the opportunity of command to numerous other fully qualified and dedicated officers.

5. Significant numbers of command selectee respondents were dissatisfied with the way in which they were notified of their selection.

6. Even though the majority of command selectee respondents indicated that their families had a positive attitude toward the Army and command, significant numbers indicated that their families influenced them toward declination.

7. The characteristics and qualities of the specific command offered were important in acceptance or declination of command (ie. location, type unit, schooling available for family members, command environment, housing etc.). Greater matchup of the specific needs of the selectee and his family to command characteristics could reduce negative impacts.

8. Negative impact of spouse's employment on command acceptance was more significant the more junior the respondent.

9. The majority of 0-5 and 0-6 command selectee respondents were homeowners. That status can be a significant factor against acceptance of command depending upon circumstances of timing, slating and the status of the real estate market in both applicable locations. Negative impacts can be reduced with adequate planning time being allowed for selectees.

10. Command related PCS's which require moving school age children contributed significantly to the decision to decline command. Age of children, location of the command and timing of the move were critical factors in the selectee decision process. In C&GSC responses

mid school year PCS's, particularly to overseas areas or involving high school students or USAREUR boarding schools all were viewed very negatively.

11. Strong feelings were noted regarding the perceived second rate nature of command of TDA units as opposed to that of TO&E units, particularly from O-5 selectee respondents.

12. Significant numbers of respondents in each category had spent a considerable number of years since their last assignment at battalion level or below. This was particularly striking in the case of O-5 and C&GSC respondents.

13. Declination of command without adverse personnel impact either before or after slating, was favored more strongly by the more junior respondents than by the O-6 selectees. Declination without adverse personnel impact prior to slating is more acceptable to all respondents than such declination after slating.

14. About half of the command selectee respondents reacted negatively to being required to complete a full command tour after being promoted to the next higher grade.

15. Data received in this study does not differ markedly from that received in the FY 79 USAWC study.

Recommendations

The study group submits the following recommendations:

1. The centralized command selection system should continue to be utilized with selection for command being made by DA selection board.

2. The list of principal command selectees should continue to be published and disseminated in accordance with current practice.

3. The list of alternate command selectees should also be published and disseminated with the list of principal selectees. Alternates should be presented in the published list in order of merit sequence.

4. Primary and alternate selectees should be individually contracted prior to slating and be asked to submit their preferences for command as well as any other personal or professional factors relevant to their assignment to command.

5. The slating process should be made less secretive and more equitable. General ground rules for slating should be published and disseminated. As clear a picture of the command opportunities for the given year as possible should be made available to all selectees prior to slating. The slating process should attempt to balance the needs of the service, equity among selectees and selectee preferences, in that order, to the utmost degree possible.

6. Notification procedures and policies for command selectees should be reviewed in order to insure timeliness, precision and appropriateness. Particular attention should be paid to the method of notification and activation of alternates.

7. In view of earlier recommendations concerning the selection, slating and notification process, it is suggested that consideration be given to allowing more flexibility to the nominee in the accept or decline response now demanded upon notification. The current practice often places undue hardship on nominees, particularly those given very short response times.

8. Consideration should be given to providing whatever additional tour stabilization that is possible to key personnel in command and staff positions above, at and below the O-5 and O-6 command levels.

9. Officer assignment policies and O-5 command selection criteria should be reviewed in view of the data developed regarding time since O-5 and C&GSC respondents' last service at battalion level.

10. Efforts should be continued to improve the image of TDA commands within the Army.

A similar questionnaire based study should be carried out with input from O-5 and O-6 command selectees if any substantive changes are made in the current system to determine selectee perceptions and acceptability.

11. Additional resources necessary to allow more detailed and personalized management of the command selection and slating process should be provided to MILPERCEN.

12. MACOM Commanders should be encouraged to better accommodate personal and family needs of new commanders in terms of timing of command assumption, designated commander housing, approval of appropriate dependent travel, acceptance of geographical bachelor status and other areas wherever possible.



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
US ARMY WAR COLLEGE
CARLISLE BARRACKS, PENNSYLVANIA 17013

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

Dear Colonel

We are writing to ask your assistance in our efforts to learn why senior officers accept or decline command. We are studying this issue at the request of the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, Army, and under the sponsorship of the Army War College. We hope to be able to shed some light on an issue that is subject to much speculation, but not much first person information from those who have made such a choice.

In 1980, three of our predecessors at the Army War College conducted a similar survey of the Fiscal Year 1979 command selectees. The conclusions of the study were guarded and the authors suggested a follow-up study. Because the number of declinations continued to be of concern, ODCSPER sought an assessment of this issue, and that is what led to our study. Accordingly, we are sending this questionnaire to all the Fiscal Year 1982 command selectees who have been given the opportunity to command. In addition to your responses to the survey questions, we are particularly interested in any written comments you may wish to include. We are trying to identify your reasons for your decision to accept or decline and not to fit your decision into our preconceived mold. Please help us get the whole picture.

In completing the inclosed answer sheet, please use only a number 2 lead pencil. Mark your answers to each question carefully opposite the appropriate question number on the answer sheet. If you need to erase, do so completely. If you wish to make written comments, please do so on the last page of the questionnaire and return it with your answer sheet in the envelope provided. In order to allow for processing and study time, we would request that you complete and return the answer sheet as soon as possible.

Thank you for your cooperation.

CHARLES T. MYERS
Colonel, CE

THOMAS R. CUTHBERT
Colonel, JA

THEODORE C. FICHTL
LTC, MI

1 Incl
as

Your answers to this questionnaire must be recorded on the answer sheet provided. Below is an example of the correct way to mark the answer sheet to ensure accurate data compilation.

Please note that only questions 54 and 55 may require use of the '0' position on the answer sheet and that 54 and 55 require the use of two columns as shown by the overprint.

1	2	3	4
*1A	0	*0*	1
1	1	*1*	1
2	1	1	1
3	1	*3*	1
4*	4	*4*	1
5	1	*5*	1
6*	1	6*	1
7	1	*7*	2
8	1	*8*	1
9	0	*9*	1

ACCEPTANCE/DECLINATION OF COMMAND QUESTIONNAIRE (SCN: ATZI-NCR-MA-84-14)

1. What is the source of your commission?

1. Service Academy
2. ROTC
3. OCS
4. Other/Direct

2. How many years commissioned service do you have (as of Dec 81)?

1. 27 or more
2. 25 or 26
3. 23 or 24
4. 21 or 22
5. 19 or 20
6. 17 or 18
7. 15 or 16
8. 14 or fewer

3. How many family members are currently living with you?

1. 8 or more
2. 6 to 7
3. 4 to 5
4. 2 to 3
5. 1
6. Not applicable

4. How many family relocations have you made in the last 10 years?

1. More than 10
2. 9 or 10
3. 7 or 8
4. 5 or 6
5. 3 or 4
6. 2 or fewer

5. How old were you at your last birthday?

1. 50 to 55
2. 45 to 49
3. 40 to 44
4. 35 to 39
5. 30 to 34
6. 29 or younger

6. Are you responding as an O-5 or O-6 Command Selectee?

1. O-6
2. O-5

7. Indicate your sex.

1. Male
2. Female

8. How many below the zone promotions have you received?

1. 0
2. 1
3. 2
4. 3

9. How many years have passed since your last duty at battalion level or below?

1. 10 or more
2. 7 to 9
3. 4 to 6
4. 2 to 3
5. 1 or less

10. Are you a:

1. Primary command selectee
2. Alternate command selectee

11. What type unit were you selected to command?

1. TOE
2. TDA
3. Other

12. Which of the following categories best specifies the unit you were elected to command?

1. Combat Arms
2. Combat Support Arms
3. Combat Service Support Arms
4. Training
5. Other

13. If you declined command, did you decline:

1. Prior to being selected
2. After selection, but before slating
3. After slating
4. NA, did not decline command

14. Would you characterize your primary reason for declining command as:

1. Personal
2. Professional
3. Family
4. Combination
5. Retirement
6. Other
7. N/A; I did not decline command

15. Do you plan to retire within the next year?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Undecided
16. Did you decide to retire (within the next year) before or after you were selected for command?
1. Before
 2. After
 3. N/A; do not plan to retire within the next year.
17. Did the command for which you were selected require a PCS?
1. Yes
 2. No
18. How much time were you or would you have been allowed to accomplish the PCS?
1. two weeks or less
 2. 15 days to a month
 3. 31 days to 90 days
 4. more than 90 days
 5. Selection for command did not require a PCS
19. How long did you remain at the location to which you were assigned prior to your command assignment, after the selection list was published?
1. less than 1 year
 2. 1 to 2 years
 3. more than 2 years
 4. Did not PCS prior to command assignment
20. Please indicate when you were selected for command by a command selection board
1. 1st consideration
 2. 2nd consideration
 3. 3rd consideration
 4. 4th consideration
 5. 5th consideration
 6. Don't know
21. How did command fit in with your personal goals at the time of selection?
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very positive

22. What was the influence of your previous command experience on your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
23. Did your personal health influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Yes
 2. No
24. How did the command tour length influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
25. How did the geographical location of the command influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
26. How did your notion of the 06/05 level command environment affect your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
27. How important was the timing of the offer of command in your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command

28. How did the type of command for which you were slated (as specified earlier in questions 11 and 12) influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
29. Did the type of Command for which you were slated correspond with your initial or additional specialty?
1. Initial Specialty
 2. Additional Specialty
 3. Neither Specialty
30. How did the personality of the person or persons you would be working with affect your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
31. How adequate was your previous military training and experience in preparing you for the type of command for which you were selected?
1. Very inadequate
 2. Inadequate
 3. Neutral
 4. Adequate
 5. Very Adequate
32. Did the presence of school-age family members in your household influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
 6. N/A; no school age family members
33. How did the health of family members influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
 6. N/A

34. How did your spouse's employment influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
 6. My spouse is not employed
 7. I am not married
35. What is your immediate family's overall attitude toward the Army?
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very positive
 6. Not applicable
36. What was your immediate family's attitude toward your being a commander at the time of your selection?
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very positive
 6. Not applicable
37. What was your immediate family's attitude toward the geographical location of the command for which you were slated.
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very positive
 6. Not applicable
38. Did your family directly influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
 6. N/A; I do not have immediate family members.

39. How did owning a home influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
 6. N/A; I do not own a home.
40. How did the number of relocations your family has made influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong influence to decline command
 2. Moderate influence to decline command
 3. Neutral influence
 4. Moderate influence to accept command
 5. Strong influence to accept command
 6. N/A; I do not have a family to relocate.
41. Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you did decline or would have declined command.
1. Lower than most
 2. Same as peers
 3. Higher than most
42. Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you did accept or would have accepted command.
1. Lower than most
 2. Same as peers
 3. Higher than most
43. Have those factors which influenced your decision to accept or decline command changed since you made your decision?
1. Not at all
 2. Slightly
 3. Moderately
 4. Greatly
 5. Very greatly
44. If you were permitted at this time to reconsider your decision to accept or decline command, would your decision be different or the same?
1. Definitely the same
 2. Probably the same
 3. Not sure
 4. Probably different
 5. Definitely different

45. Should officers be permitted to decline consideration for command without adversely affecting subsequent personnel decisions?
1. Definitely not
 2. Probably not
 3. Not sure
 4. Probably yes
 5. Definitely yes
46. Should an officer be allowed to decline command without prejudice after being slated for a particular command?
1. Definitely not
 2. Probably not
 3. Not sure
 4. Probably yes
 5. Definitely yes
47. How do you feel about publication of the Centralized Command Selection List:
1. Should be published
 2. Should not be published
 3. No opinion
48. What is your opinion of the selection notification procedure?
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very positive
49. Indicate your perception regarding the Centralized Command Selection System (CCSS) vs. the "Old Boy Net" for selecting commanders.
1. Old Boy Net is best
 2. Both are the same
 3. The CCSS is best
50. Did you decline command because you believed that you could make a greater contribution to the Army in a noncommand job?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. N/A; I did not decline command.
51. Indicate your feeling about the current command tour length.
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very positive

52. How would you feel about being required to complete a full command tour after receiving a promotion? (Commanding a battalion-sized unit as an 06 or a brigade as an 07?)
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very positive
53. Should the Centralized Command Selection System be modified to permit MACOM Commanders to have more influence in the slating of selectees for specific command?
1. Definitely not
 2. Probably not
 3. Not sure
 4. Probably yes
 5. Definitely yes
54. What is your branch? Please enter the two digit code as shown below with the first digit shown in column 1 and the second digit in column 2 of item 54.
01. Infantry
 02. Armor
 03. Field Artillery
 04. Air Defense Artillery
 05. Engineer
 06. Signal
 07. Military Police
 08. Military Intelligence
 09. Ordnance
 10. Quartermaster
 11. Adjutant General
 12. Medical Service
 13. Aviation
 14. Transportation
 15. Chemical
 16. Other --
- 1st Digit 2nd Digit
55. What is your initial (primary) specialty. Enter only the two digit code as specified in DA PAM 600-3, with the first digit shown in column 1 and the second digit in column 2 of item 55. Examples:

 1st Digit 2nd Digit

Infantry	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="1"/>
ADP	<input type="text" value="5"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>
Field Artillery	<input type="text" value="1"/>	<input type="text" value="3"/>

56. Indicate your highest level of civilian education.

1. High School
2. Some College
3. Bachelor's Degree
4. Some Graduate Study
5. Master's Degree
6. Doctor's Degree
7. Other, Specify _____

57. Indicate your highest level of military education.

1. Advanced Course
2. C&GSC or equivalent
3. SSC
4. Other, Specify _____

In each of the next questions, indicate the position on the scale that best represents your feelings about your last command assignment.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 58. Too Long | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Too Short |
| 59. Good for Promotion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not good for promotion |
| 60. High Risk | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Low Risk |
| 61. Dream Come True | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Nightmare |
| 62. Necessary for Promotion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not necessary for promotion |
| 63. Made a Contribution to the Army | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Did not make a Contribution to the Army |
| 64. What you Entered the Army for | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not what you Entered the Army for |
| 65. Was Permitted to do you own thing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Was not Permitted to do your own thing |
| 66. Great for my Family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Bad for Family |
| 67. Was a Prestigious Assignment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Was not a Prestigious Assignment |

68. Use this page to record your specific comments regarding reasons officers decline command.

ACCEPTANCE/DECLINATION OF COMMAND QUESTIONNAIRE SCN:ATZI-NCR-MA-82-14

[illegible]

C&GSC QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What is the source of your commission?
 1. Service Academy
 2. ROTC
 3. OCS
 4. Other/Direct
2. How many years commissioned service do you have (as of Dec. '81)?
 1. 14 or more
 2. 12 to 14
 3. 10 to 12
 4. 8 to 10
 5. 6 to 8
 6. Less than 6
3. How many family members are currently living with you?
 1. 8 or more
 2. 6 or 7
 3. 4 or 5
 4. 2 or 3
 5. 1
 6. None
4. How many family relocations have you made while in the Army?
 1. More than 10
 2. 8 or 9
 3. 6 or 7
 4. 4 or 5
 5. 2 or 3
 6. less than 2
5. How many below the zone promotions have you received?
 1. 0
 2. 1
 3. 2 or more
6. Indicate your highest level of civilian education.
 1. High School
 2. Some college
 3. Bachelor's degree
 4. Master's degree
 5. Doctor's degree
 6. Other, specify

7. How many years have passed since your last duty at Battalion level or lower?
1. 1
 2. 2
 3. 3
 4. 4
 5. 5 or more
 6. I have never served at that level.
8. What type unit would you prefer to command?
1. Combat Arms
 2. Combat Support
 3. Combat Service Support
 4. TRADOC Training Unit
 5. Other
 6. None
9. Indicate your sex
1. Male
 2. Female
10. How old were you at your last birthday?
1. 40 or older
 2. 34 through 39
 3. 30 through 34
 4. 27 through 29
 5. 26 or younger
11. Indicate your grade.
1. O-3
 2. O-4
 3. O-5
12. How does command fit in with your future personal goals?
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very Positive
 6. N/A
13. At this point to what extent do you think your previous command experience would influence your decision to accept or decline battalion command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. N/A

14. Do you currently plan to retire before completing a 30 year career?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Undecided
15. Do you consider the current (30+6 mth.) Battalion command tour length to be:
1. Too long
 2. About right
 3. Too short
 4. No opinion
16. How adequate has your military training and experience thus far been in preparing you for ultimate Battalion Command?
1. Very inadequate
 2. Inadequate
 3. Netural
 4. Adequate
 5. Very adequate
 6. No opinion
17. What is your family's current attitude toward the Army?
1. Very negative
 2. Negative
 3. Neutral
 4. Positive
 5. Very Positive
 6. N/A
18. If you were offered a command today, how would your family's attitude influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Not at all
 2. Toward declining command
 3. Toward accepting command
19. Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you decline an offered Battalion command?
1. Lower than most
 2. Same as peers
 3. higher than most
20. Indicate your perception regarding your chances for promotion to the next grade if you accept an offered Battalion command?
1. Lower than most
 2. Same as peers
 3. Higher than most

21. Should officers be permitted to decline consideration for command without adversely affecting subsequent personnel decisions?
1. Definitely not
 2. Probably not
 3. Not sure
 4. Probably yes
 5. Definitely yes
 6. No opinion
22. Should an officer be allowed to decline command without prejudice after being slated for a particular command?
1. Definitely not
 2. Probably not
 3. Not sure
 4. Probably yes
 5. Definitely yes
 6. No opinion
23. How do you feel about publication of the centralized Command Selection List:
1. Should be published
 2. Should not be published
24. Indicate your perception regarding the Centralized Command Selection System (CCSS) versus the previous system whereby Battalion commanders were selected by local senior commanders?
1. CCSS best
 2. Both the same
 3. Old system best
25. Would you decline command if you believed that you could make a greater contribution to the Army in a non command job?
1. Yes
 2. No
 3. Don't know
26. In your speciality do you feel that Battalion command is necessary for career success?
1. Yes
 2. No
 - c. Don't know
27. Which type of assignment listed below would enable you to make the greatest contribution to the total Army?
1. No comment
 2. Secondary ASI
 3. Command/Leadership
 4. DA/MACOM staff
 5. Other (Specify _____)

28. What is your branch? Please select the appropriate branch by two digit code.

1. Infantry
2. Armor
3. Field Artillery
4. Air Defense Artillery
5. Engineer
6. Signal
7. Military Police
8. Military Intelligence
9. Ordnance
10. Quartermaster
11. Adjutant General
12. Medical Service
13. Aviation
14. Transportation
15. Chemical
16. Other

Examples:

Infantry

0

1

Quartermaster

1

0

29. What is your initial (Primary) speciality? Enter only the two digit code as specified in DA PAM 600-3.

1st digit 2nd Digit

Examples:

Infantry

ADP

Field Artillery

30. If your wife is career oriented would her career requirements influence your decision to accept or decline command?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Not married
4. Wife not career oriented

Please answer the following questions assuming that you have been selected for battalion command at an appropriate time in the future.

31. Should command tour length (30+6 months) influence your decision to accept or decline command?

1. Strong to decline command
2. Moderate to decline command
3. Neutral
4. Moderate to accept command
5. Strong to accept command
6. N/A

32. Would slating for Battalion Command in an unaccompanied tour area influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
33. Would slating for Battalion Command in an appropriate CONUS TO & E battalion influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
34. Would slating for Battalion Command in an appropriate USAREUR TO&E battalion influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
35. Would slating for Battalion Command in TDA Training battalion influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
36. If given your choice as to the type of battalion you would command, please indicate your first choice.
1. TO&E unit appropriate to branch and speciality
 2. TDA unit appropriate to branch and speciality
 3. Other specify _____
 4. None
37. Would timing of the offer of command influence your decision to accept or decline command if you were given 30 days or less in which to prepare to assume the command assignment from time of notification.
- | | |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Strong to decline command | 4. Moderate to accept command |
| 2. Moderate to decline command | 5. Strong to accept command |
| 3. Neutral | 6. Neutral |

38. Would timing of the offer of command influence your decision to accept or decline command if you were given 6 months or more in which to prepare to assume the command assignment from time of notification.
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
39. If you owned a home at a significant distance from the location of the offered command, how would it influence your decision to accept or decline command.
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
40. Would moving your children between elementary schools in CONUS in the summer influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. N/A
41. Would moving your children between elementary schools in CONUS during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. N/A
42. Would moving your children between high schools in CONUS in the summer influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. N/A

43. Would moving your children between high school in CONUS during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
44. Would moving your children between elementary schools from CONUS to USAREUR in the summer influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
45. Would moving your children between elementary schools from CONUS to USAREUR during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
46. Would moving your children between high schools from CONUS to USAREUR in the summer influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 6. Neutral
47. Would moving your children between high schools from CONUS to USAREUR during the school year influence your decision to accept or decline command?
1. Strong to decline command
 2. Moderate to decline command
 3. Neutral
 4. Moderate to accept command
 5. Strong to accept command
 5. Neutral

48. Would a requirement to place your children in a USAREUR boarding school environment influence your decision to accept or decline command?

1. Strong to decline command
2. Moderate to decline command
3. Neutral
4. Moderate to accept command
5. Strong to accept command
6. Neutral

In each of the next questions, indicate the position on the scale that best represents your feelings about your last command assignment.

- | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 49. Too Long | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Too Short |
| 50. Good for Promotion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not good for promotion |
| 51. High Risk | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Low Risk |
| 52. Dream Come True | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Nightmare |
| 53. Necessary for Promotion | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not necessary for promotion |
| 54. Made a Contribution to the Army | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Did not make a contribution to the Army |
| 55. What you Entered the Army for | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Not what you entered the Army for |
| 56. Was Permitted to do your own thing | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Was not permitted to do your own thing |
| 57. Great for my Family | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Bad for Family |
| 58. Was a Prestigious Assignment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Was not a Prestigious Assignment |
| 59. Please give your specific comments regarding reasons officers decline command: | | | | | | | | |

59. (Continued)

[illegible]